NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXCVI.

MARCH, 1898.

IS THE CONSTITUTION OUTWORN?

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL.D.

AN apology is always due from a foreigner who ventures to speak on national institutions. But the American Republic is a universal study, and the foreigner, if, compared with the citizen, he fails in knowledge, has some advantage in his point of view.

Americans generally seem to feel that this is an anxious time. Bryanism seems to have been an insurrection of all the elements of discontent against the American commonwealth. Bi-metallism was probably the least part of it. Its silverism was not a monetary theory, but a movement of socialistic redistribution, as any one who listened attentively to one of Mr. Bryan's lectures must have perceived. The socialistic element in it was directly subversive of the principle of self-help and freedom of acquisition on which American institutions are founded. It polled a formidably large vote. It is deemed likely to do the same in 1900, and in the meantime the case for the commonwealth is hardly being improved.

Nor was Bryanism the only revolt. Do not tell us that all the enthusiasm manifested by a wealthy class on the occasion of the Jubilee was pure worship of the negative virtues which alone can be displayed by the occupant of a constitutional throne. Before the Jubilee, had not the multimillionaires been buying

Copyright, 1898, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aristocratic alliances for their daughters? Would they not gladly buy coronets for themselves? Do they not buy their way into the courts and aristocratic circles of Europe? Would they not prefer monarchy and aristocracy to the Republic?

"Surely," says Bacon, "every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils; for time is the greatest innovator, and if time, of course, alter all things to the worse, and wisdom and counsel shall not alter them to the better, what shall be the end?" The time since the framing of the American Constitution has been full of rapid, various, and momentous change in the world at large and in the United States. The territory of the United States has extended over the continent, taken in Louisiana, taken in California, embraced new conditions, geographical, climatic, and commercial. Population has multiplied twenty-fold; its character has been profoundly modified. Instead of being British it has become largely foreign; instead of being wholly a community of freehold farmers and small merchants it has become largely a community of capitalists and wage-earners, part of the wage-earners being alien by race and political training; instead of being marked by a general equality of condition, it presents the dangerous contrast of multimillionaires at the top of the social scale with masses of poverty and not a little of destitution at the other. Revolutionary movements such as socialism or anarchism—which is socialism in a state of frenzy—have spread to it from Europe. Sexual revolution and political feminism have invaded it from the same quarter. It has shared with Europe, though perhaps in a less degree, the disintegration of religious belief and the consequent withdrawal of the laws on which political and social as well as personal morality has hitherto largely reposed. A revolutionary writer paints American society as made up of two extremes—the luxurious passengers who sit at their ease on the top of the coach, and the miserable cattle who draw it. He is now read with sympathy. At the time when the Constitution was framed he would have been laughed to scorn.

The framers of the Constitution were too wise not to feel the truth of Bacon's maxim or to fancy that their work could last forever without change. They provided two modes of amendment; but the difficulty of either mode is so great as to amount practically to an impossibility, at least so long as party retains its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sway. State constitutions have been freely amended. But of the Federal Constitution there was no amendment for sixty years. The March day of Mr. Cleveland's inauguration was a day of snow, sleet, and rain, through which the hapless procession trudged for hours, while the new President stood reviewing it at some risk of catching his death. Everybody said that instead of being in March the inauguration ought to be in April, when the weather at Washington is fine. But so simple a change was deemed impossible because it would require an amendment of the Constitution in which the date is imbedded by the additional article of 1804, and the operation could hardly have been performed without making the difference of a month's Presidency between one party and the other. Momentous amendments were indeed made at the close of the Civil War, but these were the effects of an earthquake, of which they bear the trace. Stability is a virtue, reverence for the Constitution is salutary, especially when there are democratic forces and impulses to be controlled. But absolute immobility contravenes Bacon's warning, and is likely to lead to revolution in the end. There seems to be a great body of opinion in favor of lengthening the presidential term and abolishing the power of re-election. Yet no one thinks of proposing the amendment.

In one important respect the plan of the founders has distinctly failed, and the result has been as different as possible from their intentions. They meant the President to be elected, calmly and without disturbance of the commonwealth, by a small delegation of select citizens. They did not foresee that this election would become a mandate. The result is a monarchical election, something like that which once distracted Poland every four years, by manhood suffrage. Strong Presidents have no doubt exercised a salutary power as representatives of the national will apart from Congress and its factions. Something may be said in favor of the election as an education of the public mind, which on the question of silver it seems certainly to have been, though in general the atmosphere is so heated and the discussion is so factious that reason has little sway. Spectators have been impressed with the majestic sight of so many millions of citizens choosing their chief, albeit there is little of majesty in the operations of the "Boss" or in the means by which to a large extent votes are obtained. On the other hand, the Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public is thrown every four years into a struggle for the elective monarchy, with the vast patronage annexed to it, which entails not a little of the political and moral evil of a civil war. Commerce and industry are seriously disturbed. Dangerous questions are raised for the purposes of the election and all questions are brought to a dangerous head. The election of Lincoln precipitated the Civil War with its enormous waste of life and money, its havoc, its pension list, its carpet-bagging governments, and the present negro problem. The question, no doubt, was desperately difficult of solution. Yet it is hard to believe that had it not been precipitated by the presidential election statesmanship would have certainly failed to find a way. The presidential election of 1900 seems likely to bring on a crisis inferior in violence and danger only to that of 1861.

It can hardly be said that the present system is sure to put the best citizen at the head of the Republic. The conditions of availability, negative as well as positive, local as well as political, are so complicated that, in fact, there is not very much to choose between the chances of nomination and the chances of hereditary succession. Lincoln was the paragon. But Lincoln, after all, was a happy accident. He was nominated, not because it was foreseen that he would turn out as he did, but because he was the favorite son of Illinois, and the nominating convention was held at Chicago. The most distinguished man of the party, Seward, was passed over in his favor. If we can trust Mr. Morse's *Life of Lincoln*, a good deal, after all, was done by yelling. There cannot be said to be any assurance that even in a great crisis of the state a thoroughly second-rate availability will not be put at the head of the Republic.

There are complaints of the encroachment of Congress, particularly of the Senate, on the authority of the President. It would certainly seem that what was called the courtesy of the Senate, giving individual Senators a veto on appointments, was open to that imputation. It is hardly conceivable that the working of a hundred years should not have revealed practical defects or ambiguities in the distribution of powers against which the fathers, had they foreseen them, would have guarded.

It can scarcely be denied that the Senate, after so long being the sheet-anchor, has of late been losing public respect and confidence. Instead of being the conservative, it has now become

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the revolutionary House, and in cold blood, without any of those paroxysms or pressures by which breaches of legislative morality are sometimes excused, has passed by a large majority a resolution in favor of paying the public creditor in base coin. This may be partly owing to sinister influence in elections, against which no constitutional forms nor anything but the public virtue of electors can effectually guard. The corruptible will be corrupted, frame your electoral system as you will. Representatives of selfish interests or anti-national machines may have found their way into the Senate Chamber by bad means and with bad designs. But a main source of the decadence evidently has been the admission of Territories to premature Statehood in the interest of party for the sake of their Senatorial votes. That a Territory still in frontier condition, little more in fact than a ranch or a mining camp, should have an equal representation in the Senate with New York or Pennsylvania is not only a startling anomaly but a grievous wrong. The political party by which those States were admitted has paid the penalty in the conversion of the Senators to their present opinions. This evil, however, is practically irremediable, since by the original compact no State can be deprived of its equal representation in the Senate without its own consent, which would of course be withheld. Nor does there seem to be any mode of divesting an abortive State like Nevada of its Statehood. The only conceivable way of escape from the dilemma is the subdivision of the larger States so as to give them more Senators, a remedy which might well be deemed worse than the disease. It is curious that while England, by the Reform Bill of 1832, got rid of her Cornish boroughs, the American Republic should be saddled with her Nevadas for ever.

Nothing in the Constitution, however, seems to preclude a modification of the powers of the Senate, such, for instance, as would lessen the liability to legislative deadlock.

The article of the Constitution placing beyond the reach of amendment the equal representation of States in the Senate seems to be the only relic of the Compact; in other words, of the federation proper. In all other respects the United States are now not a federation proper, but a nation with a federal structure. That question, raised by Nullification, and since more signally by Secession, has been decided by the sword.

Framers of elective institutions have thought too exclusively

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of representation and too little of statesmanship. The framers of elective institutions for America certainly thought little of statesmanship when they limited the term of Congressmen to two years. It is not possible that a legislator should be formed in so short a time. Most of the members are probably taken from a class better versed in the working of party machinery than equipped with higher political information. A Congressman's time and attention are largely engrossed by the local affairs of his constituency. A Congressman could plead that he had answered four thousand letters, besides granting interviews without number. The term is still further abridged practically by the re-election of the incoming before the departure of the outgoing House, the outgoing House, though it continues to sit, being from that time morally defunct. The matter is made worse by the local restriction on elections, not imposed by the Constitution, but imposed by the people on themselves, which excludes the ablest and best of citizens from the service of the commonwealth if he happens to live in a hive of the other party. The meeting of Congress is regarded with dread, especially by commerce, and its departure is felt as a relief.

The great miscarriage of all, however, and the one which most urgently calls for a revision, if it be possible, of the Constitution, is the want of initiative and control in legislation and, still more palpably, in finance, arising from the exclusion of the responsible ministers of state from the assembly which makes the laws, regulates the expenditure, and imposes the taxes. The Fathers were evidently under the influence of Montesquieu, a superb writer but hardly a profound thinker, since he failed to read correctly that which was immediately under his eyes, taking the forms of the British constitution for the forces, and fancying that in England the executive, legislative, and judicial powers were in different hands, when, in reality, the prime minister and his cabinet not only form the executive and appoint the judiciary, but, having seats in Parliament, control legislation, financial and general. A sort of substitute for responsible leadership is no doubt found in the system of committees and in the employment of the Speaker as a party leader, little consonant as that function is to his proper office. But the inadequacy of the substitute is proclaimed by the state of legislation and still more lamentably by the state of expenditure and finance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Whoever reads Mr. Bancroft's *History of the Constitution* must be struck by the total absence of any reference to party or the party system of government in the debates of the Convention. In the mind of Washington party was faction, a malady of which he hoped to get rid by combining the leaders of different factions in his council. Party is now the government of the United States, not only practically installed, but formally recognized by law. But the Constitution is not adapted to the working of party system, as is that of England, where the system originated, and where it moulded institutions to itself. A party in England has permanent and responsible leaders, looking forward to office even when they are not holding it, embodying the principles of the party and regulating its action. America has only Presidents, whose leadership of the party, if leaders they are, is, during their term, precarious and almost clandestine, while as soon as their term is over they are for ever laid aside. What there is of leadership is mainly done by "bosses," indifferent substitutes for such political chiefs as Chatham, Pitt, Canning, Grey, and Peel.

Party is an accident of English history, not inherent in the political organism of man. Over the political world generally, if it can be said ever to have been thoroughly inaugurated, it is now manifestly breaking up. It is breaking up even in England, its native seat, for there are now five sections at least in the British Parliament. In the United States it displays a singular and sinister tenacity of life. Its organizations, with their names, seem capable of surviving a total change of principle. The Democratic organization was disembowelled at Chicago; for nothing can be more anti-Jeffersonian than the socialism of Mr. Altgeld. Nevertheless, it lives and appears to be drawing back to it a part at least of its Jeffersonian following who invert their principles that they may preserve their organization. Parties have before now degenerated into mere Shibboleths without loss of members or of virulence; but such fidelity to a name as is shown by Jeffersonian Democrats who accept the Chicago platform history does not record. Still, even in the United States, party shows signs of dissolution. "Mugwumpery" is not a mere mutiny or a craze; it is a sane, and likely to prove a lasting, revolt of independent patriotism against the autocracy of the "boss." Besides "Mugwumpery" there are Populism, Silver-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism, and Sectionalism of other kinds—stray sheep which it will be difficult to bring back to the orthodox party folds. Reductions of patronage, such as civil service reform, weaken the bond of party and the ascendency of the "boss."

If party is, as it appears to be, in its decadence, what is to succeed it as the motor of parliamentary government? That is the question for all statesmen at the present day. It is a question at once so momentous, and so far at present from any discernable solution, that we can understand, up to a certain point, adhesion to the party organizations, notwithstanding all their vices, as the only visible preservatives from a political chaos. In the meantime it is useless, as was said before, to kick and rail against the "boss." An organizer and manager the party machine must have. Leaders there cannot be while the President and his ministers are excluded from Congress. There is nothing for it but the "boss."

It is true the American system enables the President to call to the departments of state able administrators who are not orators or "bosses." On the other hand, the change of the administration every four years is fatal to continuity of policy. In England, though the foreign ministry changes hands, the ex-minister is still there to represent his own policy and to modify that of his successor. But in the United States the thread is completely broken. The treatment of the Canadian question is a striking instance in point.

The revolutionary character of Bryanism was marked by its attitude towards the Supreme Court, whose decision against the constitutionality of the income tax, it must be owned, had come at an unlucky time. It was hardly to be expected that the Supreme Court, being human, would entirely escape political influence. It did not escape political influence when Taney made it the instrument of the slave-owner, or when, by its decision in favor of legal-tender paper, it became the instrument of government necessity, real or imagined, arising from the Civil War. Lincoln did not think it wrong to say that he would take care to fill a vacancy in the Court with a man who was right-minded on the great political question of the day. The power of the Supreme Court may be deemed somewhat inordinate so long as for want of facility for constitutional amendment its judgments are practically irreversible, and, under the political influence of the hour,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may not only determine, but perhaps modify the Constitution. Interpretation is the sole province of the courts. To the national legislature it belongs to alter or determine the Constitution.

The Supreme Court has decided that, under the Constitution as it exists, the Federal government has the power of issuing inconvertible paper and making it legal tender. That no such power is expressly given to the Federal government by the Constitution, and, not being expressly given, is by the general principle withheld, was Mr. Bancroft's argument on the other side. The Fathers had just undergone an experience of the legal-tender system such that Tom Paine himself actually wished to make any proposal to return to it punishable with death. Legislation such as impairs the obligation of contracts, which the issue of legal-tender paper plainly does, is expressly forbidden, it is true, only to the States, not to the Federal government. But it is forbidden to the States in company with acts of attainder, *ex post facto* laws, and the grant of titles of nobility—things evil in themselves, the first two everywhere, the third in a republic; and things forbidden as evil in themselves are surely by implication renounced. At all events this is a point for reconsideration and settlement. Should such a movement as Bryanism ever succeed, there would be no saying what use might be made of the article which the judgment of the Supreme Court has grafted in the Constitution. In fact, inconvertible paper as a legal tender is only a step beyond payment in base coin for which the Senate has already voted.

In touching on the next point the writer cannot help showing the cloven hoof of a free-trader. Practice must be held to have determined that the Federal government has constitutional authority to levy taxes, not only for the purposes of revenue, but for that of protection. Yet we can hardly suppose that the Fathers foresaw the protectionist system, or that they would have sanctioned it if they had. Their experience of protectionism under British rule was not likely to incline them that way. Webster, in arguing, as in his better day he did, against the protective policy, could say with truth that it was not American. The original plea of infant industries needing to be fostered by monopoly has long since become a jest; the iron grasp of the gigantic infant is on your throat. Granting it to be possible that it might be expedient for the state to foster certain in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustries at the expense of the rest, there is, in a Republic at least, no impartial authority to decide which industries shall be fostered. In the absence of any such authority the practical result is a scramble of rival interests, in which that which has the strongest and the most unscrupulous lobby wins, and of which the political as well as the economical effects are disastrous to the state. Even if protectionism cannot be directly charged with the origination of measures, like the Pensions Arrears Act, for the purpose of baling out the surplus, it can certainly be charged with a general tendency to the encouragement of such expenditure as will prevent customs duties from being reduced. It breeds commercial antagonism, from which political antagonism may spring. It gave birth to Nullification; it had something, at least, to do with Secession. The only visible line of cleavage which, since the abolition of slavery, at all threatens the integrity of the Union is the commercial line drawn by the tariff between East and West. Mr. Reed is alarmed at the prospect of territorial extension, fearing that it may bring about disruption. But the Federal system is elastic enough to bear territorial extension even over the whole of this northern continent. It is far more elastic than the autocracy of Russia. That which, if anything, threatens disruption is the tariff. A power of Federal taxation limited, so far as customs duties were concerned, to an equal *ad valorem* duty on all imports, variable in amount with the necessities of the treasury, would involve no danger of this kind. The article in the Constitution dealing with the taxing power seems to require reconsideration in the light of experience.

Louisiana, following the example of two other States, is calling a convention to rescind, so far as she is concerned, the constitutional amendment enacting that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The policy of purchasing Louisiana, bringing with her, as she did, not only a great area of slavery, but tendencies, now manifesting themselves, to tropical extension, may some day afford a theme for the sceptical historian. The fifteenth amendment was framed by a party flushed by victory in a civil war and deprived of its sagacious head. That it has failed to solve the question of the races is too evident; but it seems better that it should be sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted, if possible, to constitutional revision, than that it should be unconstitutionally rescinded or impaired under some tricky form by any recalcitrant State.

The vital change made in the character of the population by the influx from Europe since the Constitution was framed, suggests the questions of the franchise and of naturalization. That of the franchise may be taken to be suspended till a distant future, when experience shall have fully revealed the effects of universal suffrage. That of naturalization is more practical, at all events so far as relates to the provision of safeguards surer than those which existed in the days of wholesale Irish naturalization at New York. Restriction of immigration is not likely to be very effective in diminishing political danger. As the native American shuns coarse labor, a supply of it must be imported, and is sure to bring with it illiteracy and a measure of lawlessness. The illiteracy may be cured in time by the schools, the lawlessness by a better police. More dangerous to national character than illiteracy or lawlessness are the tendencies of the Russian or Hungarian Jew, whom no educational test excludes.

If Cuba is annexed, it is not likely that it will be the last annexation. Other islands will probably follow her in time. As the population is likely to remain long unfit for self-government, it will be necessary to insert in the Constitution an article regulating the government of dependencies, and the article will need to be skillfully framed, since the government of dependencies is a task to which democracy has not yet shown itself adapted. If the government of dependencies is introduced, we may look for a change, not only in the enactments of the Constitution, but in its moral basis and in the political character of the people.

To all this and more that might be said to show that after a lapse of a changeful century the Constitution is in some respects outworn, it will probably be replied that revision is hopeless. Hopeless it undoubtedly must be so long as the party conflict continues to rage. Yet weak points, such for instance as the want of responsible control over finance, when distinctly seen, may in some measure be practically covered, and the edifice may be patched so as to stand, though it cannot be thoroughly repaired. Its soundness is apparently about to be tried by the stress of no ordinary storm.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DO FOREIGN MISSIONS PAY?

BY THE REV. FRANCIS E. CLARK, D. D., PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR.

In the United States and Greater Britain there are to-day nearly one hundred foreign missionary societies in the Protestant churches, employing about nine thousand missionaries, and with an income of nearly eleven millions of dollars annually. At the first glance these figures seem to indicate a great amount of interest in the foreign missionary cause.

But when we examine the figures more closely and the world-wide field that they cover, they seem to be either too large or too small. If the idea of creating throughout the world a Christian civilization is altogether visionary and Quixotic, as many people believe, then the sum expended for this purpose is too large by nearly eleven millions of dollars. If the reports of the globe-trotters who, on the grand tour, go from treaty port to treaty port, chiefly making the acquaintance of the bar-rooms of the hotels with their assortment of choice and congenial spirits, are to be believed, then missions are indeed a failure, and those who give their dimes or dollars, as the frequent contribution box passes on its rounds, are the victims of a stupendous hoax.

Many of these gentlemen who thus make the acquaintance of the mission field, as seen through wreaths of tobacco smoke or through the bottom of a wineglass, do their utmost, doubtless in a purely philanthropic way, to warn the deluded missionary enthusiasts of Europe and America of the futility of their efforts, and some of our newspapers lend themselves with great alacrity to the furtherance of the benevolent efforts of these gentlemen.

But there is another side to this question which cannot altogether be seen from the coign of vantage obtained in the bar-room of the Hong Kong hotel or of the hostelries on the Yoko-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hama Bund. If this view of the case is the correct one, then the 9,000 men and women who are in the field are an entirely inadequate force to perform the work undertaken, and the $11,000,000 annually expended show an altogether trivial conception of the work to be accomplished. To attempt to civilize and Christianize the world, the whole wide world, India and Africa and China and Japan, with their countless millions of people, and the islands of the sea, and all the Mohammedan lands as well, with $11,000,000 a year, a sum which a "billion dollar Congress" would not think sufficient to run the government of our country for eleven days, a sum which would cut no figure at all in the annual clearing house statistics of many a large city, seems gross presumption from this standpoint, and can only be excused on the ground that Christianity believes in the modern multiplication of the four loaves and the two little fishes.

In part, I believe, the differing opinions in regard to the value of foreign missions arise from an inadequate conception of the wonderful impetus which has been given to the arts and sciences, to literature and knowledge of all kinds, to commerce and material advancement, by this century of missions.

To be sure, the question, "Do foreign missions pay?" will be regarded by the devout Christian who gives his money for the conversion and spiritual enlightenment of the heathen world as a question almost impious in its materialism, as though the value of missions could be decided by a *quid pro quo* of dollars and cents or the increment in the world's store of knowledge. But to a great many people the fact that missions do pay returns of a thousand per cent. in all things that count for the world's progress will add a new element of sanity to the appeals of the missionary, and make the persistent appearance of the contribution plate seem more reasonable and possibly less intrusive.

Two long journeys around the world, during each of which much time was spent among the missionaries of various Protestant denominations, visiting their schools, speaking in their churches, noting their methods of work and of administration, have convinced me beyond the possibility of cavil that, whether looked at from the highest or lowest standpoint, from the viewpoint of the spiritual or the material, foreign missions do pay a larger return on the money expended than any form of investment of which the world knows.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But assertions are easily made, and I will not ask my readers to take my opinion or accept any statement based on my observation alone lest they consider me as much prejudiced, from another standpoint, as the gentlemen of whom I have already spoken. The facts are easily attainable and our opinions need not rest upon the assertion, *pro* or *con*, of any traveller.

For a hundred years, roughly speaking, Protestant missionaries have been at work in non-Christian lands. What have they added to the world's stores of knowledge and enlightenment? What have they done for commerce and civilization? Have they added any nations to the ranks of civilized countries? These are fair questions and they can be fairly answered.

If it can be shown that the sum total of the world's knowledge has been increased, that natural science has been illuminated, that geography, philology, and archæology have gained vast new areas of knowledge through the missionaries; if it can be shown that commerce has been increased and been made possible in many lands where life and property have been made secure by the teachings of the missionaries; if it can be proved that education has been fostered in every land where the missionary has gone, it will not be too much to claim that foreign missions pay.

Consider the one science of geography alone. What royal geographical society has such a record in discovery and exploration as have the missionary societies of America and Great Britain? The two names of Livingstone and Moffat would never have appeared in the list of the world's great geographers were it not for the missionary impetus that sent them forth. Stanley and Baker and Chanler have gone to Africa to make brief journeys from coast to coast; Livingstone and Moffat and Stewart, and scores of others, have gone to Africa to live. Their explorations have not been matters of weeks or months, but of a lifetime, and they have often pioneered the way for men bent on purely scientific research.

The names of a few great missionaries are familiar to all the reading world, but it is not so well known that the contributions to geographical science by scores of unknown men have been scarcely less important. Who of my readers, for instance, knows the name of Rev. J. Leighton Wilson, and yet one of the most important contributions to the geography of Western Africa was made by him. "His book," says Dr. Laurie, "was written by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no transient visitor who could see only the surface of things, but by one who had spent more than eighteen years in the country, who had visited almost every important place along the coast, and made extensive excursions into the interior. He had reduced to writing two of the native languages and had more than ordinary facilities to become acquainted with the life of the people, their moral, social, civil, and religious condition as well as their peculiar ideas and customs. He gives an account of the ancient inhabitants of Africa, its principal divisions, ancient discoveries on the continent, its natural scenery, its rivers, mountains, seas, and climates; he narrates at length the Portuguese discoveries and dominion there, and the early enterprises of the English, French, and Dutch. Then he describes in detail Senegambia, the two great rivers that combine to form it, and its people, the Jalos, Mundinoes, and the Fullahs, the characteristics of each, and their relations to each other. So he goes over northern Guinea, comprising Sierra Leone, the grain coast, its different tribes, their peculiar customs, style of building, agriculture, social condition of the people, products of the country, their food, the domestic habits and dress of the women, the government, their deliberative assemblies, with specimens of their oratory, and so on."

Similar testimony might be borne to many another unheralded missionary. A large library might be formed consisting entirely of the additions made by Protestant missionaries to the world's knowledge of geography, ethnology, philology, and history.

In a paper read before the American Institute several years ago, Mr. G. M. Powell, of the Oriental Topographical Corps, gives this unqualified endorsement of this view: "Probably no source of knowledge in this department has been so vast, varied, and prolific as the investigations and contributions of missionaries. They have patiently collected and truthfully transmitted much exact and valuable geographical knowledge, and all without money and without price, though it would have cost millions to secure it in any other way. This, with their work as a civilizing and commerce-creating agency, is so much net gain, a parasitic growth on the tree of life they go to plant." Let us hope that this "parasitic growth" may not kill the tree of life, but may gain constant vigor and nourishment from the roots of the tree around which it twines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Geography and philology have, with much force, been called missionary sciences.

Said the celebrated Professor Whitney: "I have a strong realization of the value of missionary labors to science. The American Oriental Society has been much dependent upon missionaries for its usefulness. There would hardly be occasion for this society at all but for them." While Professor Agassiz testified: "Few are aware how much we owe them both for their intelligent observation of facts and for their collecting of specimens. We must look to them not a little for aid in our efforts to advance future science."

The same qualities which have led the missionaries to contribute so largely to geographical science have made their contributions to geology and meteorology of inestimable value. They have not been professional geologists, but they have gone to the remote corners of the world, and have gone there to live. The phenomena of earth and air and sea have been forced upon their attention. The treasures of the coral have been disclosed to them in their journeys from island to island, the volcano has exploded its magnificent fireworks for them alone so far as white man's eyes were concerned, and cloud and hurricane have yielded up unguessed secrets to their observing eyes, for there were none others to behold them.

In the realm of archæology their contribution to the world's knowledge has been simply incalculable, and to give even a catalogue of the towns which they were first to explore and with whose location and ruins they have made the world familiar, would be of itself beyond the limits of this article.

Moreover, their contributions to the cabinets of the country, especially of our colleges, are exceedingly numerous and valuable. Their means, to be sure, have been small, but in diligence, painstaking care, and intelligence in selection they have during long lives spent in lands of peculiar interest to the archæologist greatly enriched the world's collection of ancient treasure.

In the science of medicine, if medicine can be called a science, while some valuable remedies should be ascribed to missionaries, their great work has been in disabusing the minds of whole nations and peoples on the power of charms and philters and superstitious knickknacks, and of displacing them with medicines of undoubted value.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The *materia medica* which many missionaries found in force in the country of their adoption was grotesque, almost beyond belief. In Arabia we are told the patella of a wolf hung from the neck is a cure for the mumps, and the written amulet is very efficacious, especially if *eaten* by the patient.

The great medical work of the Chinese, says Dr. Wells Williams in "The Middle Kingdom," is called Pun Tsau, and this wise volume declares that the pure white horse is the best for medicine, and that to eat the flesh of a black horse without wine causes death. The heart of a white horse, hog, cow, or hen, when dried and rasped into arrack, cures forgetfulness. The "night eyes" of a horse, that is the warts above the knees, enable him to see in the night, and also cure the toothache, while the ashes of a skull taken in water cure insomnia if the patient uses another skull for a pillow.

Here is a Chinese receipt for ulcer. Pulverized serpents, one ounce; wasps and their nests, half an ounce; centipedes, three ounces; scorpions, six, and toads, ten ounces; grind thoroughly, mix with honey, and make into pills. Even these pills are quite palatable compared with the cure for the itch, which, according to the Chinese, will be relieved by swallowing small toads alive.

It will be seen that the missionary with even a rudimentary idea of medicine has a very large field for the use of his limited knowledge, and many who do not profess to be medical missionaries, but have gone out to minister to the souls of men, have been the physicians of their bodies as well. When, however, we remember that one large branch of the missionary service is distinctly in the line of medicine and surgery, and that they seek admittance to the hearts and the homes of the people through the highest skill which our best medical schools can impart, we can see the vast contribution to the sum total of the world's health and well-being that missionaries have made.

I have been intensely interested and impressed by the medical missionary work that I have seen in many parts of the world. In Canton is a great hospital under the charge of the Presbyterian Missionary Society, in which are treated every year scores of thousands of the lame, the halt, and the blind, the sick, and the sore. Up the great Pearl River every year goes the medical missionary's houseboat, carrying health to thousands more.

In the famous heathen city of Madura, in Southern India,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where, perhaps, is the most extensive and wonderful Hindoo temple in the world, stands a new and beautiful hospital erected by the labors of Dr. Van Allen, one of the indefatigable missionaries of the American Board, and this fine hospital, with its light and airy and comfortably furnished wards, and its appliances for treating every case of medicine or surgery, was built, not by American money, but by contributions of the people to whom our missionaries have been sent. Every rupee of the more than forty thousand which it cost was contributed by men whose religion the missionaries had gone to overthrow. Yet so great is their faith in the missionary, in his self-sacrificing devotion, and in his skill as a physician, that this large sum has been given outright and in perpetuity to the American missionary society that sent out this beloved physician.

I have very often been touched in many remote districts to see the skill and loving tenderness with which these medical missionaries care for the unspeakably filthy and wretched patients who throng around their doors. The rheumy, festering eyes of these wretched mortals, the filthy rags with which they are clothed, their matted, vermin-infested hair, the running sores with which they are afflicted, all combine often to make them the most gruesome and repulsive of beings; and yet, with a gentleness and skill born of a genuine love for God and humanity, these medical missionaries in a foreign land, with no hope of gaining fortune or reputation, care for their poor diseased brothers in yellow or black, as the case may be, as though they were all kings' sons and daughters. Indeed, in their eyes these are the sons and daughters of the King of Kings, and this likeness which they have discovered and this sense of brotherhood which is theirs have sent them across the sea on this superlative mission of mercy. There is many a Doctor McClure on the mission field who deserves the eulogy of a pen no less skilful than that of Ian MacLaren himself.

Opposite the men's hospital in Madura, of which I have spoken, is another hospital for women, which, though on a somewhat smaller scale, is doing equally good work. In the heart of Turkey in Asia, in the town of Talas, near the old city of Caesarea, is a hospital built by another American, Dr. Dodd, which is doing a work no less valuable than that I have already described. Here amid the persecutions and massacres, amid the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wars and rumors of wars, this brave missionary and his noble wife, together with all the other missionaries in this field, both medical and evangelistic, have stood at their posts, inadequately protected by a weak government, which sometimes in the past has seemed to be afraid to defend its own citizens. Here they have remained undaunted, refusing to be driven out by the force of the Turk or to be coaxed away by his wiles. If there are nobler instances of heroism in the world's modern history than have been exhibited by our American missionaries in Turkey I am unaware of their existence. To be sure, this heroism of the evangelistic missionary, and this tenderness and skill of his medical brother, cannot be counted among the material assets of missions, but they ought not to be left out of sight. When the books are made up and the accounts closed, I believe that they will be found to swell vastly the enormous total on the credit side of modern Protestant missions. I have been able to refer to only a few of the scores and scores of missionary hospitals and dispensaries which number their patients by millions.

In the field of philology, as is entirely natural, the missionary has very largely put the world in his debt. He could not do his work without some knowledge of the language of the people to whom he has been sent.

The beginnings of comparative philology, it is said, rose from a comparison of the translations of the Lord's prayer in the fifteenth century by Roman Catholic missionaries. In 1784 a polyglot vocabulary was published in one hundred and fifty languages and the Lord's prayer in more than three hundred. Indeed, it was the progress of missions in this century that so increased interest in the subject of philology, that Professor Lepsius of the Royal Academy at Berlin prepared his "Standard Alphabet for Reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters." At a meeting of philologists called together by Chevalier Bunsen, at which a large number of missionaries were present, Professor Lepsius' alphabet was adopted, and since then has been applied to innumerable African and Asian languages.

The immense work that has been done for the study of language is shown by the fact that one of our American missionary associations alone does its work and prints its literature in forty-six languages. It is no empty boast to say that these missionaries

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are among the best masters of the Chinese language, the Tamil and Marathi, the modern Syriac and Kurdish, the Turkish, Armenian and Bulgarian, also the Arabic and modern Greek, the Zulu, Kaffir, Grebo, and Mpongwe, and other languages of South Africa. Besides these languages, the missionaries of this one society have been proficient in Hebrew, Spanish, Ancient Syriac, Gudjerati, Sanscrit, Hindustani, Portuguese, Persian, Telugu, Siamese, Malay, Dyak, Japanese, Marquesas, Minocresiah, Crete, Osage, Seneca, Abenaquis, Pawnee, and three languages of Oregon. More than twenty of these languages were reduced to writing by the missionaries of this board.

When we remember that this is only one American society, and that its total expenditures are but little over half a million dollars a year, and that other missionaries of other boards are doing an equally important work, it is evident that if philology must answer the question, "Do missions pay?" it would be with a very emphatic affirmative.

An American missionary, Dr. Jonas King, was chiefly instrumental in promoting the introduction of the modern Greek scriptures into the schools of Greece itself.

When in the town of Serampore, not far from the city of Calcutta, a few months ago, I saw in a bookcase of the Baptist College of that place a most astounding monument to the perseverance and genius of one man. There, on a single shelf, were piled high, one above another, no less than forty Bibles or portions of the Bible in as many different languages and dialects, all of them the work of the pioneer missionary of the nineteenth century, the Rev. William Carey, a name revered and honored in all Christian circles. He was the man whom Sidney Smith sneeringly called in his early days, when he wielded the shoemaker's awl and hammer, the "consecrated cobbler," but the "consecrated cobbler" became the greatest Sanscrit scholar of his time. He became professor of Sanscrit in the college at Fort Edward, at a very large salary, all of which he devoted to missionary purposes, and, as I have said, left this monument of Bibles of his own translation behind him. Most of these are in use to-day, for no better translations have ever been made, and yet this was only a small portion of the self-denying labors of this missionary hero. No wonder that an eminent writer of the Ethnological Society of New York enthusiastically declares: "Missions en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able the German in his closet to compare more than two hundred languages; the unpronounceable syllables used by John Eliot, the monosyllables of China, the lordly Sanscrit and its modern associates, the smooth languages of the South Seas, the musical dialects of Africa, and the harsh gutturals of our own Indians." "But for the researches of our missionaries," says another, "the languages of further India," and he might add of most of the rest of the world, "would be a '*terra incognita.*'"

The contributions of the missionary to the science of philology naturally lead us to consider his relations to the general subject of education. But this is too vast a field to enter upon thoroughly in such an article. Surely no one will be hardy enough to deny that it pays to educate the human race. It pays not only the race that is educated, but every civilized nation and race on the face of the earth; for education means civilization, and civilization means progress, science, art, commerce, the interchange of ideas and the interchange of goods, larger markets, greater stability of government, more enduring peace.

Who can doubt, for instance, that if the Latin republics of South America were brought to the same level of education and civilization as the English-speaking republic of North America, the commerce of our country with those nations would be increased many fold, and a vastly larger market would be opened for our manufactures? Even more strikingly would this be true of Africa and Asia in their relations to Europe and North America, if the same standard of civilization prevailed in all quarters of the globe.

The reader, untravelled in missionary lands, would be surprised to see the extent to which these representatives of our churches have carried out their ideas of education. The schoolhouse, to be sure, in their opinion, is subordinate to the church, but, as with their Puritan ancestors, the schoolhouse always comes next to the church, and often stands by its side. Speaking in a general way, it is not too much to say that there is not a missionary on the field to-day, among all the nine thousand who have gone out from Protestant lands, who is not also an educator.

Under the care of the Protestant missionary societies of the world, there are almost a million pupils under instruction, or to be exact, according to the very latest statistics, 913,478. It is probable that every three years at least a million new pupils come

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the instruction of our missionaries. Who can estimate the tremendous leavening power, constantly exerted in all the dark corners of the world, through this agency? So thoroughly is the vast utility of missions as an educative force recognized by those who have looked into the matter, that in India and other British possessions the appropriations for educational purposes which are made by our missionary boards are doubled by government grants. That is, for every dollar which the church people of America contribute for missionary schools in India, the British government adds another dollar on condition that the pupils pass a reasonable examination and show ordinary proficiency. These government grants, it must be remembered, are not made because of any partiality to the tenets and doctrines taught by the missionaries, not because of any great love of British statesmen for evangelistic services, not because they are philanthropists, or yearn for the conversion of the heathen, but because, as hard-headed men of business and politics, they see that the cheapest and best way of civilizing their subject races, and of fostering their own commerce and the prosperity of the empire is by working hand in hand with the missionaries. In the opinion of the British Foreign Office evidently missions do pay.

But the educational work of missions is not confined to elementary schools, or to the lower classes of the population. The colleges and universities which have been built up through the purely philanthropic gifts and labors of the lovers of missions are some of the noblest monuments to the value of this great nineteenth century movement. There are missionary colleges in many parts of the world which would compare not unfavorably with Dartmouth or Williams or Rutgers. There are colleges in all missionary lands with fine buildings, modern equipment and fair endowment, and the number of whose students is limited only by the possible accommodations. Such institutions are the great colleges of the Free Church of Scotland in Madras and Bombay, the Methodist College in Lucknow, the Presbyterian College of Beyrout, and those most useful institutions started by the American Board, Robert College in Constantinople and the Doshisha in Japan.

The influence of these universities—for some of them are little less than universities in the best sense of the word—has been widespread and beneficent beyond calculation. The educated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

classes of India to-day are the product of these missionary colleges. There is no other educating influence worth comparing with them for a moment. The graduates of Robert College are influential in half a dozen nationalities of southeastern Europe, and the Doshisha of Japan is one of the mighty influences which, within a quarter of a century, have brought old Japan out of the middle ages into the brightest electric glare of nineteenth century civilization.

If all this is true of the more civilized nations of the Orient, it is doubly and trebly true of the darker and more benighted tribes to which our missionaries have gone. Consider the condition of the Hawaian Islands now and in the days when Titus Coan first landed upon their coral shores. Consider the revolution wrought in the Samoan Islands and in Fiji and many other islands of the South Pacific by a few undaunted missionaries.

In most of these remote islands there have been absolutely no other civilizing uplifting influences at work. Commerce has brutalized and degraded the people. It has brought "fire water" and tobacco and lust and disease. It has enfeebled and almost annihilated the weaker races when it has touched them. The missionary influence alone has kept them alive and given them the large measure of prosperity which many of them to-day enjoy.

One of the islands of the Pacific, which a little more than a generation ago was inhabited by cannibals of the lowest type, during the recent famine in India sent no less than four thousand dollars to relieve the sufferings of their far-away neighbors. Had any one predicted at the beginning of this century that before its close Fiji would be occupied by a civilized, God-fearing, benevolent people who should give four thousand dollars of their hard earnings for the relief of the sufferers in India, he would have been laughed to scorn as a foolish visionary.

Were there space, it would be pleasant to relate more specifically what peculiarly large dividends missions have paid to our own country. The few millions of dollars which during the century our people have contributed have returned many thousand per cent. in actual cash dividends. Hawaii alone, whose civilization is entirely due to missionaries, and which to-day would be a desolate waste in the Pacific if commerce alone had been left to have its way, has sent back to the United States in trade returns more millions of dollars than have been spent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by our people in all foreign missionary operations the world around.

One very large section of our country was saved to the Union by reason of a missionary's forethought, enterprise, and indomitable pluck. The story of Missionary Whitman's thrilling ride from the Northwest Territories to the city of Washington need not here be rehearsed. In this his centennial year the story is too well known to every well-read patriot to be recounted. It is sufficient to say that, for a wide grasp of the possibilities of empire, for prompt decision, for self-sacrificing heroism, for far-reaching consequences upon the history of our nation, the midwinter ride across the Rockies of that noble missionary has never been equalled in the annals of our country.

Had it not been for Whitman, a vast section of North America, comprising those marvellously productive States of Washington and Oregon, would inevitably have been lost. To all intents and purposes, Whitman was a foreign missionary, having left his home to convert the Indians of the then unknown Northwest, and his famous ride, so far as America is concerned, will go far towards answering the question, Do missions pay?

Many a devout Christian, perhaps, will be almost impatient with us for not considering the matter in its spiritual aspects. He will say, "Here you find the true value of missions. From this standpoint alone can the question be answered, Do missions pay?" But this is beyond the scope of this paper. A thousand sermons and articles deal with this view of the subject. We are looking at the matter solely from the more material view-point. But even in this light, considering what missions have done for the arts and sciences, for geography, and geology, and meteorology, and archæology, and philology, for education and civilization in their largest and broadest sense, for the building up of schools and colleges, for the leavening of nations with the yeast of modern civilization, for trade and commerce, and the widening of our empire, there can be but one answer to the question of our title, and that a strong, sweeping, unconditional, uncompromising YES.

FRANCIS E. CLARK.

While many authorities have been consulted in the preparation of this article and considerable personal experience in missionary fields has been drawn upon, the author desires to express his peculiar obligation to "The Ely Volume," by the late Thomas Laurie, D.D., a perfect thesaurus of information on all lines of foreign missionary enterprise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR FUTURE ON THE PACIFIC—WHAT WE HAVE THERE TO HOLD AND WIN.

BY COMMODORE G. W. MELVILLE, CHIEF ENGINEER, U. S. NAVY.

THE closing years of the century seem to be, in all lands save our own, years, not of war, but of a strenuous making ready for it. Alsace and Lorraine, the Eastern Question in its many varied phases, and the jealous rivalry as to colonies and dependencies, make continental Europe but a camp, with more than three million men constantly under arms. England is yet quenching the flame of revolt which flashed among the wild tribes of her Indian frontier; and in the Soudan, too, she is marching on. Spain drains her uttermost resources for Cuba's fading tenure. In the far East, with China's sudden fall, the balance of power has been disturbed and the throb of the war-drum seems not yet stilled but muffled only. "There never was a time in the history of the world," General Miles has said, "when so much energy, ingenuity, and wealth were being expended to maintain large standing armies."

On the sea there sounds the same foreboding note. Great Britain, despite her matchless naval array at the Jubilee, will have under construction during the present fiscal year over 100 vessels. France, with many now building, will lay down others aggregating 45,000 tons displacement. Germany plans a modest increase in a battleship, some gunboats, and torpedo craft; but the Kaiser's eager insistence on a great sea force is widely known. Russia—silent, mysterious—moves swiftly in her up-building as a naval power, not only in armor-clads, but in cruisers of great steaming radius. Japan is executing a programme which will give her navy a total addition of 200,000 tons. Even China, whose ships went as sheep to the slaughter, dreams of a fleet revived, and is said to be considering estimates for its creation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Only the United States moves slowly, calm in the consciousness of peace, although the Chilian and Venezuelan affairs, the undying strife in Cuba at her doors, and the cloud, "the size of a man's hand," in Hawaii have given fateful warning that the "detached and distant situation" of which Washington wrote will shield her no longer from international complication and, it may be, conflict.

The Marine Engine and Modern Naval Strategy.—It has been well said that, "with the development of the marine engine, the sea unites, rather than divides, widely separated lands;" and to this it may be added that the swift progress of steam in marine propulsion has been a most potent factor in shaping the exterior policy of maritime nations, and, still more, in modifying the scope and methods of naval strategy.

On the land, rails of steel, traversing valley, plain, and mountain, make easy the path of the flying express and the fast freight, which, together, conquer time and distance in the binding into a homogeneous whole of the many States which form a republic almost continental in extent; but the railroad is fixed, a permanent way, whose direction varies only with new constructions. The sea, on the contrary, gives a track—fluid, mobile, universal—which turns wherever swift prows may point, and on which massive hulls, much too huge for any form of land transit, may pass with ease from port to port.

Moreover, when in 1805—nine years after Washington wrote of America's "distant situation"—Nelson "chased, half around the world, a French fleet nearly twice the force of his own, scared by the very terror of his name," his fierce ardor fretted itself to fury with his ships, which, through a run of 7,000 miles of sea, averaged but 93 miles a day, or less than four knots an hour.

"Salt beef and the French fleet are better than roast beef and champagne without it," said the great admiral in beginning his stern chase. He found that fleet, and with it death; but in the finding, through those lagging months, while drifting or beating over those leagues of sea, he must have felt to the full the limits which stinted the sea power of his time.

Steam has changed all this. Over the same Western Ocean which Nelson, bitterly impatient, crossed and re-crossed so slowly in 1805, the United States cruiser "Columbia" swept, ninety years later, at a speed of 18.41 knots per hour, or four and three-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quarter times that of the ships, which, dull sailers though they were, were very sure and deadly in their work at Trafalgar.

This passage, in its sustained speed through such a distance, was not only a triumph, yet unequalled, for American naval engineering; it was, as well, a flashing illumination of the strategic fact that America's isolation, militarily, from European and Asian nations had diminished, in this age, in most marked degree. While it is not yet possible for the performance of the swift "Columbia" to be equalled in a trans-Atlantic run by armored battleships, it seems quite certain that Nelson's speed can be increased nearly three-fold and that within two weeks a European fleet of any required strength could be thrown upon our Atlantic coasts with one-third of its coal-supply remaining.

Geographic Isolation Not a Safeguard.—The geographic isolation, apparent or real, of any people has never yet been respected by superior force; it forms no sure guard when, in peace or war, the nations of the earth come knocking at the door. Ancient Peru, peaceful, rich, unwarlike, was many leagues from Spain, and between them the waves of two oceans rolled. Yet there came Pizarro and his adventurers, soldiers less of Spain than of the lust of gold. The Inca fell and the land was stripped of its fatal wealth; its people were enslaved, and in slaughter, torture, and rapine a noble civilization perished.

In later times, China, arrogant and ignorant, learned, in a measure, the same lesson. While her officials babbled of invading England, overland, through Russia, the war of 1840 was waged against her by the people of that small island, parted from her by a hemisphere; and that war wrested Hong Kong from her shore-line, seized, in indemnity, twenty-one millions of dollars from her treasury, and, by force, opened five of her ports to the commerce of the world.

These examples, it is true, come from the conflicts of higher civilizations with those differing from them more in kind than in degree; but the world's annals are not bare of similar illustrations from the wars of less unequal foes. It is well to remember that, during the Revolution, there were landed in America nearly 50,000 foreign troops; that in the war of 1812 British forces of nearly 25,000 men attacked the territory of the United States; that our ports were blockaded, and that, in 1814, our capitol was burned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, then, it be admitted that the safeguard which the detached situation of the United States has given her grows weaker with every advance in the methods of sea-communications; if, no more, she watches from afar, in security and peace, the growth and strife of over-sea peoples, as alien largely to her own interests; if the "Titan of the West" is, no longer,

"Behind a thousand leagues of foam, secure,"

then it would appear to be the part, not only of national wisdom but of national salvation, to conserve and fortify that which remains to her of advantage in location, by adequate coast-defences, by a powerful fleet, and by the occupation, as opportunity shall come, of out-lying islands, her shore-line's frontier-posts.

Wealth of the Pacific States.—"Imperial in extent and of extraordinary growth"—so said James G. Blaine in 1881 of our possessions on the Pacific coast, adding that the territory dependent on that ocean for commercial outlet comprised "an area of nearly 800,000 square miles, larger in extent than the German Empire and the four Latin countries of Europe combined."

These strong words find but emphasis and amplification in the striking discussion of our national statistics presented recently in this REVIEW by Michael G. Mulhall, F. S. S., of England. The total wealth, in the year 1890, of the eleven States included by him in the Pacific group, he gives as 6,811 millions of dollars, or $2,318 per inhabitant. With but six per cent. of the population of the Union, they hold ten per cent. of its wealth. Their railway mileage is greater than that "of any European state except France or Germany, and their wealth exceeds that of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, in the aggregate."

While during the forty-four years ending with 1893 they produced nearly 2,900 tons of gold and over 30,000 tons of silver, having a total value of nearly 3,000 millions of dollars, analysis shows that these States are not mining camps, and that their swift growth dates, not from the days of '49, but from the year 1870. At that time their possessions were valued at 727 millions of dollars; during the two decades which followed their wealth increased nine-fold to the magnificent total already stated, of which mining properties form but eight per cent.

Of profound importance is the fact that the richest portion of this territory is that which is most exposed to blockade, raids, bombardment, and the losses and suffering which attend warfare

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or invasion from the sea. Three only of these eleven States lie upon the coast, California, Oregon, and Washington; and these three hold, of the total wealth of the group, 57 per cent., or 3,885 millions of dollars. Two thousand five hundred and thirty-four of the millions are the share of California, the "isle of many jewels and much gold" of the old Spanish romance—a title which seems hardly apt, since, while her mines are valued at 83 millions of dollars, her buildings and farms reach 1,746 millions, owing, doubtless, to a soil and climate which give her vineyards of 30,000 acres and fruit-gardens the most extensive and productive in the Union.

The slender share which the United States has won thus far in trans-Pacific trade is shown by the fact that, although San Francisco is the seventh city of the Union in population, there passed through the Golden Gate in the year ending June 30, 1896, but 4.39 per cent. of our total import and export trade, with shipping entries of 1,200,000 tons. The Pacific Coast, as a whole, is credited with a share of this total trade, amounting, during the year as above, to 5.69 per cent.

Alaska.—Linked far more with the future than with the present of the Union is Alaska. Purchased from Russia in 1867 for seven and one-quarter millions of dollars, this territory, for long years discredited, bids fair to repeat, in part, the history of California, and, from the products of its mines alone, to repay many times over its relatively trifling cost. Years, not distant but at hand, will more than vindicate the judgment and foreknowledge of the great Secretary, whose name will live in the history of the wide lands he acquired in the far north.

With an area, including those of its coast islands and the Aleutian Archipelago, of 580,170 square miles, Alaska is nearly six and a half times the size of the States of New York and Pennsylvania combined. On Behring's sea and the Arctic and Pacific oceans it has a coast line of 4,750 statute miles. The perennial friction over its seal fisheries clouds the worth of other resources far more valuable. In its wide-spreading forests of cedar, pine, hemlock, and fir there is a world's supply to draw on when other sections fail, while its catch of salmon, cod, and other food fishes is, in amount and quality, unexcelled, if equalled elsewhere.

Alaska is, in effect, an over-sea province, separated from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union not only by British Columbia, but, in great part, by a long stretch of ocean. Excluding the narrow strip along the coast of the continent, the air-line distance from San Francisco to the nearest point of its compact area is fully as great as that to the Hawaiian Islands, or over 2,000 miles. To Attou, the farthest island of the Aleutian group, this distance is doubled. The development and protection of this most valuable territory will give problems for the future far from easy of solution.

The Development of the Pacific Ocean.—As with the Pacific States, the development of the vast ocean which they confront, the largest and noblest body of water on the globe, has been, not slow and lingering, but almost wholly deferred until a recent period. To the comparative inaccessibility of its seas, the long waiting must be ascribed in great degree. It cannot be doubted that, if nature had but cleft a water-way through the American isthmus, the growth of the Pacific, to the northeast and the south, would have begun almost with the coming of Columbus.

But this was not to be. Barred on the southeast by the stormy terrors of Cape Horn, its northern portals were blocked, seemingly for all time, by the polar floes. More than two hundred attempts were made to double the Arctic coast of America, before Franklin's men laid down their lives in "forging the last link of the Northwest Passage."

The Northeast Passage has a story, not so continuous, but lacking not one whit in the fortitude and daring of the stern seamen who, there, essayed the Arctic highway, whose lofty purpose held "either to bring that to pass which was intended, or else to die the death." Sir Hugh Willoughby, in 1553, led the van, sailing for those unknown seas to find, not the passage, but slow death in the White North. It was left for Nordenskjöld, nearly four centuries later, to complete the task begun by that heroic sailor.

And so, through the ages, the eastern and southern Pacific slept on in primeval peace, its dark waves unvexed by any alien keel, while to the westward empires, kingdoms, and republics rose and fell. With the dawn of the modern era there sailed the Genoese, dreaming but prophetic, "to add a new hemisphere to our globe," and in 1513, from the peak in Darien, Balboa, the *conquistador* looked on the unknown ocean. Eight years later Magellan passed through his fog-enshrouded straits and a Euro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pean keel first cleft its waters. Through the labors of those who followed, from Drake to Vancouver, and notably of Cook, the work of discovery, and to some extent of colonization, went on.

Progress, however, was so slow that, in the year 1830, it was estimated that there were not more than 500 men of Anglo-Saxon race west of the Sierra Nevada, on the continental shore; much of the island territory of the South Seas was little known and yet unclaimed; and, as to Australia, not until 1845 was there dispelled the error that there existed, within its borders, a great inland sea.

Within a decade or little more, however, the full awakening of the Pacific seems to have come. The outward surge of the nations of the Old World, so marked in its effects upon the African continent, has sent, as well, waves of unrest over the placid ocean which have broken on the shores of its uttermost island. Long ago William H. Seward, in addressing the United States Senate, said, as to the commerce, politics, thought, and activities of Europe, that they would "ultimately sink in importance, while the Pacific Ocean, its shores, its islands, and the vast regions beyond will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter."

Realization, more or less full, of this seems to have created, as to the southern Pacific, in these recent years, a feverish hunger for island territory, whose ravenous desire fails only with that on which it feeds. In 1885, Germany—whose greed for Samoa has been so open and so strong—annexed the great Marshall group, midway between the Australian steamship lines from British Columbia and the possible Asian lines of the future from the isthmus; France added to her large possessions in New Caledonia and the Society Islands by taking the Marquesas Islands and the Low Archipelago; and Great Britain has declared protectorates over island after island and group after group—the Gilbert, Ellice, Phœnix, and many others—all on, or near and flanking, her steam routes from British Columbia to Australia and New Zealand. Her flag thus floats over most of the territory of the southern Pacific, and is seen as far north as Johnston Island, 600 miles from Hawaii.

Only the United States has stood aloof, while other nations have acquired territory in these waters which covers and guards the commerce of the coming years. "While we have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been talking in our sleep about Hawaii," a keen observer notes, "England has occupied and possessed a score of islands in the greatest of the oceans." There may come a time, when the sons of a Greater United States will deplore, as slumberous unwisdom, the policy of to-day, since, in a commercial and strategic sense, *Ultima Thule* itself seems to have been seized in the South Seas.

In striking array, the Honorable John R. Procter has marshalled the political changes which have come, in these recent years, to Pacific and Indian shores and islands, with their potent effects on the part which the great ocean, its lands and peoples, shall play in the world-wide drama of international life and strife.

"The presence of Russia in the Far East and the possibility of a combination between Russia and China, followed by the awakening of China from her sleep of centuries; the extension of French dominion in Indo-China, Siam, and Madagascar; the partitioning of Africa and the islands of the Pacific among European powers; the industrial growth of Japan and her entrance into the family of nations as a great naval and military power; the completion of the great military highways from Halifax to Vancouver, and from St. Petersburg to Vladivostock; the rapid peopling of British Columbia and our North Pacific States, and of the Amur and Manchuria districts—all tend to change the front of the world and to transfer to the placid Pacific the national activities which for three centuries past have rendered the Atlantic the theatre of stirring events."

On the shores of such an ocean, confronting such a future, there stands the vanguard of our Pacific States, the stately advance of that Western domain—imperial, truly, in its extent, its present wealth, and its potentiality of riches beyond the dreams of to-day—which the republic, its statesmen, its fleets and armies, cannot guard too well. With unstinted possibilities of progress, that future holds, for it and for the nation, the dangers of contact and of conflict on this ocean with powers, old or new in the world's history, whose political or commercial interests the swift changes of the years may make antagonistic to our own.

Defences of the Pacific Coast.—During the early days of the Civil War, the isolated and unprotected condition of the Pacific States aroused fear for their safety, in the—then possible—event of intervention, in that conflict, by European powers. For a generation, a transcontinental railway had been under intermittent discussion, and the possible danger of attack in the West gave the matter definite shape in the passage, in 1862, of an act, which, with its later amendments, offered government aid of a most generous character in the building of such a road.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A broad right of way was given through the national domain, with ample grants of public lands, and with the issuance to the company of government bonds to a large amount—reaching, in some cases, $48,000 per mile—in exchange for second mortgage bonds of the road. Thus, through the vital necessities of defence in the stormy years of war, there was born the movement which ended in the building, with unstinted national expenditure, of the Union Pacific Railroad, whose last spike was driven in 1869.

The facilities now offered for the transportation of troops would seem to render improbable the successful invasion by land of the Pacific States. Doctrines formulated in the early days of the Republic still hold in keeping the army of the United States low in numbers, although not in efficiency. Back of it there stands, however, a militia of 112,000, with a force, unorganized but available, of over ten million men capable of bearing arms. The three Coast States have a total militia of about 6,100, and California alone has, in addition, 205,000 men, available but unorganized. From continental foes, the Pacific group would seem to be secure, although the absence of a large force of trained soldiery might be felt in the first actions of a sudden war.

With the shore-line and the sea, however, different conditions are presented. According to the authorities of the Coast Survey, the Atlantic seaboard is 2,043 statute miles in length, the Gulf coast 1,852 miles, and the "Pacific coast-line, from the Mexican boundary to the Strait of Fuca, including the Straits of Race Rock Lights, is 1,810 miles." Excluding Alaska, then, the rich territory on the Pacific is bounded by one-third of our total shore-line, and upon this coast, exposed directly to bombardment from the sea, there are four large cities. To a very recent date, at least, the defences have comprised but obsolete works at San Diego, San Francisco, and the mouth of the Columbia River.

It is true that the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications has presented estimates, aggregating nearly three millions of dollars, for guns, emplacements, and barracks at the points named, with Puget Sound in addition, but this material forms only a fraction of the 500 high-powered guns, 1,000 mortars, 360 rapid-fire guns, and 6,000 submarine mines now under construction for the protection of nearly 25 harbors on the three coasts. It is stated that not more than one-half of the total number of guns will be in place by the summer of 1898, and with the pressing demands

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Atlantic and the Gulf it is to be presumed that the West will be given no precedence.

Again, to man the whole of these sea-coast batteries, the present artillery force must be strengthened by the enlistment and training—the latter a work of time—of not less than 7,500 men as a skeleton organization in peace, to be increased to, probably, 30,000 in war. It would seem, then, that the defences of even the four main points of the Pacific coast are wholly inadequate, and are likely to remain so for a considerable period; while, in the end, the many vulnerable positions remaining on that extended shore line, beyond the fire of these fortifications, will be indefensible, save by a fleet.

Long ago, for England, Sir Walter Raleigh laid down her true policy of defence, a policy which succeeding generations sometimes remembered, sometimes forgot, as the years passed; but which she has reaffirmed most significantly as the century draws to a close. Not for world-empire, nor for commerce-defence only, has she "doubled her navy in *personnel* and material, and more than quadrupled it in warlike efficiency, during eleven years of the profoundest peace the world ever saw." In his *Historie of the World*, Sir Walter says:

"But, making the question general, the positive, *Whether England, without the help of her fleet, be able to debar an enemy from landing*, I hold that it is unable to do so, and, therefore, I think it most dangerous to make the adventure."

Again, the Duke of Wellington, in writing Sir John Burgoyne, as to the English coast from the North Foreland to Portsmouth, said that:

"Excepting immediately under the fire of Dover Castle, there is not a spot on the coast on which infantry might not be thrown on shore at any time of tide, with any wind and in any weather; . . . that, in that space of coast, there are not less than seven small harbors, or mouths of rivers, each without defence, of which an enemy, having landed his infantry on the coast, might take possession, and therein land his cavalry and artillery of all calibre, and establish himself and his communications with France."

If this be possible in England, with her compact territory guarded by stormy seas, and despite her 250,000 available combatants outside of the garrisons, providing only that the command of the sea be lost for the time, it may safely be said that, with a fleet weak, absent, or defeated, the long stretch of Pacific shore must afford not a few vulnerable points, far from the great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

centres, susceptible of easy seizure by hostile ships, and capable of efficient defence by their forces, while used as a base for naval operations on the coast.

The fleet is, then, an element of the utmost importance to the defence of what Mahan calls "our weakest frontier, the Pacific." At the beginning of the present year the United States had on the western coast nine vessels, aggregating 35,141 tons displacement, and, across the Pacific, in Asian seas, five more of 13,846 tons, a total force of fourteen modern vessels of 48,987 tons. Reinforcements to this fleet from the Atlantic coast could reach California only in about ninety days, or more, from New York, allowing for necessary stops *en route*, and after steaming through more than 14,000 miles, in waters on which the United States has not one station for supplying and refitting vessels. The time, the distance, and the probable difficulty of coaling in foreign ports after hostilities shall have begun practically prohibit relief in the swift coming of modern war.

Japan has, at this time, a fleet building and built, the latter almost wholly, of forty-eight vessels aggregating 173,057 tons, excluding torpedo craft. Great Britain, at the close of last year, had stationed in her Pacific, Australian, and China squadrons a total of forty-one vessels of 97,200 tons. The Siberian fleet of Russia at that time comprised thirteen cruisers and six torpedo boats, to which should be added the ships from the Cronstadt station doing duty in Pacific waters.

It will be seen that with this great and defenceless coast to watch, the United States has there on guard a modern war-tonnage equal only to about one-half that of Great Britain in this ocean and to about 28 per cent. that of Japan. It is true that the comparison is but general; that many of these foreign ships are small; that a long stretch of the Pacific parts many from our shores; and that other conditions would prevent the despatch, by either nation, of more than a portion as attacking fleets.

On the other hand, behind Great Britain's squadron lies a limitless reserve, and from Esquimault, if she could hold that fortress, or from Hawaii, if she could take the islands, she could throw a fully equipped fleet on this coast. Of Japan, granting her Hawaii, this is true also; and, since the naval strength of that young giantess grows faster than the virile locks of the blind Samson, her power for attack increases every day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With a fleet so weak that it can neither command the sea nor defend fitly its coast, the strides which steam has made in the methods of sea-communication gives a gravity, without precedent hitherto, to the danger of maritime invasion. Unobstructed on the ocean, Spain, although poor in money and weak in military power, has yet been able to transport, in less than eighteen months, across 3,000 miles of sea, nearly 190,000 troops to Cuba—a feat without approach in the annals of modern war.

This object-lesson, still in full view, gives, for the future, added force to the question put by Murat Halstead:

"What will happen if the Asiatic redundant population instead of moving westward and finding land in Europe, as they did thousands of years ago, should turn eastward and contest with us the American shores of the Pacific?"

In reviewing the defences, ashore and afloat, of the Pacific coast, it would seem that, in the past, the action of the nation has been governed in this—as, for a generation, in many military matters—by a spirit of self-confidence, of easy optimism, which would be warranted only if "the battle-flags were furled" for all time. Naval and military authorities have done their utmost with the forces at their command. "We, the people," alone are at fault.

"To provide for the common defence," was one of the purposes for which our fathers ordained and established the Constitution. This purpose seems here to have failed of full execution in coast-defences, in the fleet, and in the past refusal of Hawaii, the island outpost of this shore.

Captain Scriven, U. S. A., writing in 1894, contrasts national confidence with actual conditions, thus:

"We have fought the great war of modern times, we have had millions of men under arms in the field, our military power on land is without limit, therefore we are unconquerable—such is the reasoning. But we forget that the United States is, by nature and by neglect, one of the most vulnerable nations of the world, and that no great power has so vast an extent of frontier exposed to the attack of an enemy."

It should be remembered, too, that this war cost half a million lives, a direct outlay of 2,675 millions of dollars, and a great pension list which now, more than thirty years after, reaches 140 millions—a debt which the nation pays, in thankfulness, not only to the fading ranks of war-worn men, now maimed and old, who marched to the music of the Republic's battle-hymn and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spent their blood like water for the flag; but to the kin of many another who, on sea or land, gave, for that flag, even life itself and now sleeps, in peace, beneath the Southern pines or in the silent depths of the dark sea.

But how much of this was necessary? What blood and treasure were spent in vain through lack of preparation of war material, of a trained *personnel*, in such land actions as the first Bull Run or such sea-fights as that between wooden frigates and the iron-clad "Merrimac?"

Our Commerce on the Pacific.—The United States has a further interest than defence alone in the Pacific, its islands, and its distant shores. We have, as has been shown, a territory dependent on that ocean for commercial outlet of 800,000 square miles; larger than the combined area of the German Empire, France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, while the wide expansion of the transcontinental railroad system and the probable completion, in early years, of the Nicaragua Canal, give other States as well interests of grave importance in Pacific and Asian commerce.

With fertile soil, improved methods of agriculture, and appliances as a whole without equal for manufacturing, the United States, despite its home market, whose demand stirs the envy of the world, has much to spare for other lands. The exports of domestic merchandise for August, 1897, were valued at 79½ millions of dollars. During the year ending June 30, 1896, the exports include, of domestic merchandise, 863 millions; of bread-stuffs, 141 millions; of provisions, etc., 131½ millions, and of cotton, unmanufactured, 190 millions.

The wealth of the United States exceeds that of the United Kingdom by 20 billions of dollars, and it increases at a rate hitherto unknown to history. The growth in manufacturing may be judged from the advance in the amount of manufactured products sent abroad. In the year ending June 30, 1894, these products formed 21.14 per cent. of the total exports; in that ending June 30, 1896, their portion was 26.47 per cent., and they aggregated in value about 228½ millions of dollars.

Agriculture gives not only an enormous total production, but that production is obtained, through improved machinery, by a minimum of human labor so low as almost to forbid comparison with the methods of Europe. There is yet, also, a vast acreage untilled, the Pacific States alone, eleven in number, hav-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing but six per cent. of their area under cultivation. Mulhall states that the aggregate energy, in foot-tons, of France, Germany, and Great Britain is almost exceeded by that of the United States, and says further, as to agriculture, that the labor of each farm-hand throughout the Union is equivalent to a production of 14 tons of grain, and, in the Pacific States, to 30 tons. The average, per hand, is thus fully eight times that of Europe.

The extent of, and the possibilities for America in, the markets to the westward of her shores are indicated by the Hon. John R. Procter when he says:

> "More than one-half the population of the world is in countries fronting the Pacific and Indan oceans. The foreign commerce of the countries bordering these oceans—excluding North America—already amounts to over two and one-quarter billions of dollars a year. . . . The time is approaching when the cotton-growers of the South, the wheat-growers of the West, the meat-producers of our plains, and manufacturers and wage earners all over our land, will realize that exclusion from Asian markets will be disastrous to their best interests."

As has been stated, but 5.69 per cent. of the total import and export trade of the United States passes through Pacific ports, which in itself gives indication of our feeble interest in the markets of Australasia and the Orient. While the commerce between these regions and both coasts of the United States is considerable, it forms but a fraction of their vast foreign trade.

China, alone, imports yearly goods valued at nearly 130 millions of dollars; the imports of Japan amount to 138 million yen; those of British Australasia to 51 million pounds sterling. And so this world-trade mounts: while to Asia, during the year ending June 30, 1896, we sent but 25½ million dollars' worth, to Oceanica but 17 millions' worth, and to Africa less than 14 millions' worth; the total exports to these countries reaching thus but 56½ millions of dollars—diminutive, indeed, for countries whose foreign trade is 2¼ billions.

There seems no doubt that, with the growing production of the United States and its swelling tide of exports, a traffic, steadily augmenting, will flow from her western shores to the littoral of the Orient, to Australia, and to the Pacific islands. In this commerce, the Atlantic seaboard will, doubtless, share largely, with the opening of the waterway which will transform the Nicaraguan Isthmus into an ocean cross-roads where the East and the West shall meet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Shipping on the Pacific.—Closely allied with the future commercial interests of the United States on the Pacific should be the revival of its shipping, an industry whose decadence is, at once, a source of loss and of reproach. In the steady, if not swift, growth of our interests in the markets of that ocean, with the comparatively sudden leap in our over-sea trade which the Isthmian canal may bring, it seems impossible that the present deplorable conditions in trans-oceanic service shall continue.

The Commissioner of Navigation, in his report for 1897, gives the registry for foreign trade as less than 800,000 gross tons—the lowest record since 1841. We have now a foreign commerce over seven times as great as in 1846, while our shipping in the traffic over-sea is but about eight-tenths the tonnage thus employed in that year. To Great Britain mainly there accrue the profits from the express and freight service of the oceans.

Without reference to that which might be gained by a powerful American marine in service between foreign countries, the magnitude of the drain upon national resources for the carriage of our own sales and purchases should impel action for relief. Of this enormous loss Senator Elkins has said:

"The United States pays $500,000 per day, or nearly $3 per capita per annum, to foreign ship-owners for carrying what its people sell and buy;"

and a competent authority estimates further the amount lost annually in freight and passenger tolls and in the industrial increment represented by the necessary shipbuilding as over 300 millions of dollars.

Before the days of iron hulls and before the "Alabama" and her consorts had left ruin in their wake, the United States showed its power to compete successfully on the ocean with the carriers of the world. The noble vessels of the new naval fleet, the steamers—superb, if but few—built for trans-Atlantic traffic, and the growth of shipbuilding on the Great Lakes, all show that our artisans have not lost their former skill.

On the lakes especially the expansion of commerce has been swift and large. The tonnage which goes through the St. Mary's Canal is nearly twice that of Suez; although, with this, it should be remembered that the average length of the passages made by steamers through the latter is sixty days, while through the former it is but six. During the year ending June 30, 1897, there were documented for lake service one and four-tenth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

million tons of shipping, an increase of about 100 per cent. within a decade. In that period, also, the cost per ton (dead weight ability) of large steamers has fallen more than 50 per cent. in the lake shipyards; and there are now afloat fully a score of vessels of 8,500 tons displacement. The lake tonnage built during the last fiscal year exceeded that of all other sections combined.

The triumphs of the merchant marine of the old days, which bore our flag on every sea, and the great and growing fleet, constructed and employed at home, in lake and coastwise traffic, show, despite our meagre tonnage in the foreign trade, that shipbuilding and ship-owning are not exotic industries in the United States. It cannot be, then, that the nation will long delay in taking again that high place on the sea, from which, for a generation, it has turned to develop the lands, the manufactures, and the markets of half a continent. The coming years should see, not only a vast commerce on the Pacific, to and from our shores, but, as well, a merchant marine, flying our flag, traversing every highway of that ocean—a great fleet which the nation by wise laws should foster and strengthen, and, by its armed forces afloat, should lead and guard.

But little more than a century has gone by since, on the winter wind at Valley Forge, there streamed a ragged flag, the star of hope to the stern soldiery whose bare and bleeding feet reddened the snow as they guarded it there. In the generations that have passed, that flag, with the clustering memories not only of victory by land and sea, but of many a year of happy peace, has swept from ocean to ocean.

Shall a noble destiny lead it still farther on, as

> "Bright on the banner of lily and rose,
> Lo! the last sun of our century sets?"

Shall its purpose hold, to follow the pathway of the stars, "to sail beyond the sunset," and floating over Hawaii in mid-Pacific to guard the golden shore of the Republic and to win a new glory on that wide sea?

GEORGE W. MELVILLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL MORALS AND COLLEGE GOVERNMENT.

BY PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, D. D., LL.D., WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY AND ADELBERT COLLEGE.

THERE are two theories of the relation of the American college to its students. One is that the college is a family, that the college officers stand in the place of the parent, and the students in the place of the son. It is, therefore, the duty of the college officer to maintain watch and ward over each student. The rules and regulations of the college are supposed to take the place in the college of what the family gives through its various personal ministries. A second system of government is the very opposite of the domestic; it is a system that is distinguished by its lack of government. The college has no relation to the personal character of the student; the college is concerned only with the giving of instruction, and the student in his function of a student is concerned only with receiving instruction.

These two systems seldom exist in the naked and bald form in which I outline them, but, as theories, they obtain to a very great extent. Between them are to be found many practical modifications; the emphasis is sometimes placed upon the domestic side and sometimes upon the side of freedom; and in the same college at varying periods the emphasis varies.

In the discussion of these and related theories at least four questions emerge: (1.) Are American college students old enough to determine their own conduct? (2.) Should the college attempt to control the private and personal life of students? (3.) Should the college demand of students conduct which their homes do not demand? (4.) Is there any method by which even a small minority of college students can be saved from going to the bad?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The age of men entering the ordinary American college is now about eighteen and one-half years; it varies, of course, in different colleges, and also in the same college at different periods. The average age of the members of the freshman class of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, entering in the fall of 1897, was a little more than eighteen years and six months. This age has in the course of the present century increased. At the present time, however, through better methods of education prevailing in the secondary schools, the age is in many colleges lessening, but it is safe to say that eighteen and a half is the average age of the collegian beginning his course. Is a student, therefore, of an age from eighteen to twenty-two years sufficiently mature to be left to himself in all matters of conduct? Is he fitted to work out the salvation of his character without supervision or aid of any kind from the officers of the college?

It is certainly true that some men are fitted to perform this most serious and happy task: some men at twenty years are as mature as other men are at thirty. At eighteen some boys have habits as well formed, both in point of the content of the habit and its fixedness, as others at the age of twenty-five. It is also true that certain boys at the age of eighteen and twenty are as unformed in respect to the constant application of fixed principles to conduct as others may be at fifteen or even twelve. A friend of mine writes, saying:

"In general, ——— College did not do its duty by me; it took me at sixteen out of a quiet home in a remote town and gave me no affectionate personal supervision of the older brotherly sort, and not even effective surveillance of the schoolmaster kind. I think the active, personal interest, then, of a good college professor might have expedited my eventual development at least five years. My own and my friends' principles were not established; we squandered time atrociously, though not in vice, beyond whist and a little beer; had no regular habits in work and in play, and in general were negligent and neglected children."

The man who now writes these words is a conspicuous author, and he writes them after more than twenty years absence from the college in which he was a student. Another, who also was a student in the same college and at the same time, writes as follows:

"The average student in my day was quite as much controlled by principle as the average man of the world, more under such control, I think. I doubt if more stringent regulations than existed would have secured better results."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is to be at once said that the degree of maturity which is found in college students depends to a large extent upon whether they were fitted in high schools and lived in their own homes during the time of preparation, or whether they were fitted in academies away from their homes. In certain colleges a large proportion of the students come from high schools; in other colleges a large per cent. come from academies which are in corporate association with the colleges themselves, and in other colleges a large proportion come from the large and independent academies. In the twenty years between 1866 and 1885 the public schools furnished about twenty-nine per cent. of the members of the freshman class of Harvard College; from 1866 to 1869 the proportion was thirty per cent.; from 1870 to 1873, thirty-three per cent.; from 1874 to 1877, twenty-nine per cent.; from 1878 to 1881, thirty-one per cent.; and from 1882 to 1885, twenty-six per cent. About the same proportion entered from endowed schools, such as the Phillips Academies, and the balance came largely from private tutors and from other colleges. Students who enter our colleges from endowed schools are usually fitted to regulate their own conduct, but those who find their first absence from home contemporaneous with their entrance to college, who, in other words, while pursuing their preparatory course, lived at home, should not at once be given absolute and entire freedom, or, if this is given to them, it should be given to them under such personal or semi-official conditions as to cause them to feel the restraining inspiration of friendship. Every man who enters Yale College at once feels the difference, in the maturity of his class-mates, between the men who entered from the Hopkins Grammar School and those who came from Andover and Exeter. The truth, therefore, seems to be that some boys are old enough on entering college to be left to themselves, and some boys are not. The general truth is that those who enter college are neither boys, as some say they are, nor are they men, as others also affirm, but that they are young men; certain characteristics of boyhood still are theirs, certain characteristics of manhood are also theirs; from the condition of boyhood they rapidly emerge and as fast enter the condition of manhood.

It becomes, therefore, evident that in certain cases it is the right, even if not the duty, of the college to control the private life of students. It is also evident that in certain cases it is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expedient for the college to attempt any such direction. But it is just to say that the college as a college is deeply interested in the private life of each of its students. For the college desires that each student shall secure the noblest, richest, and best results from his college course. Nothing can be foreign to the college which promotes the interests of its students. The only question for the college to consider is the general question, By what ways and means can it best influence the private life of each man who is committed to it for four years? It may be said, I think, that students at once are rebellious against the control of their private life by the college authorities, and are also hospitable to all general influences of the college that look to the formation of their best character. Students wish to be helped; students do not wish to be commanded; they are open to influence, but not to control. Personal influence, therefore, rather than law represents the wise method.

Not a few American colleges are subject to a difficult condition in respect to the control of their students. American education has not yet fully and exactly articulated itself. In most, but not all, of the universities which attempt to give graduate instruction, the department of graduate instruction and the undergraduate department are very closely related; graduate students are usually found in undergraduate classes, and certain undergraduate students are frequently found in classes designed primarily for graduates. This condition obtains both in Cambridge and in New Haven. On the other hand, many American colleges have in very close association with themselves a preparatory department. Even if there be a formal division made between the work of these two departments, the same general influences control the students of both departments; frequently, too, the students in the two departments recite in the same classes on certain subjects. Graduate students represent a degree of maturity and worthy self-direction which undergraduates do not possess, and undergraduate students represent a degree of self-control which preparatory students can lay no claim to. When these two classes of students, the graduate and the undergraduate, are placed under the same general conditions it is difficult to subject them to the same general control, and also, when undergraduate students and preparatory students are found to be in the same institution, it is difficult also to ask them to obey the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same set of rules. But the necessity is laid upon the officers of institutions which are beset with these duplex or even triplex relationships to ask students of varying degrees of maturity and of immaturity to submit to the same governing principles and methods. The fact is that those principles and methods which are fitted for the less mature set of students are those which ought to prevail. College authorities think it is better to subject undergraduate students to the same conditions which preparatory students ought to submit to, than to give to preparatory students that freedom which undergaduate students might properly enjoy. With the increasing differentiation prevailing in American education this difficulty, however, is sure to lessen.

The best method of guiding the personal morals of a student is through making constant and severe intellectual demands upon him. Hard work is an enemy to easy morals. Professional schools attempt only indirectly to influence the personal character of their students, but the officers of such schools hold that the most effective method of aiding students to maintain uprightness in conduct is by maintaining high scholastic standards. Such a method should control in the undergraduate college. The man who works hard in college, who is required to devote eight or ten hours a day to the performance of his academic tasks, has usually little time for evil indulgence; or, if he has time, has little strength; or, if he has strength, has little inclination; and the man who lacks time, strength, and inclination for base indulgence is quite sure of being free from it. The question whether attendance upon recitations shall be voluntary or whether the rules in a college shall be strict is a minor question in relation to the necessity of making intellectual requirements severe.

In addition to the aid which necessity of hard work gives in the securing of a fine personal morality, every college should recognize that the personal relation of professors to students is of primary value. The importance of this relation is becoming more and more conspicuous. The system known as "Advisors" obtaining at Harvard represents and embodies this method. The nickname, which is given among the students to advisors, of "nurses," embodies in essence the idea of the personal relationship. One of the officers of the college writes me in reference to this system, saying: "The more I see of personal work among students the greater I believe its power to be; the only drawback

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the shortness of life and the necessity that an instructor should have some time for study." The first duty of the teacher in the American college is to teach; his second duty is to teach; failure in teaching is fundamental. But when the professor has taught he has not finished his duty, he is still to give himself as a person to his students in such ways as he deems fitting, in order to help them to become better persons.

As a part of this general relationship of the college the relation of the students to each other is not to be so easily passed over, as it has often been; for older students may be of the greatest help to the younger. The influence of college student over college student is frequently of greater value than the influence of college professor over college student. We recognize the power of influences toward evil; the value of the influence of the student toward good may be equally strong. Students, like professors, who have the qualities of a strong personality united with tact, patience, and enthusiasm, may be of the utmost worth in helping their associates to the best life.

One special means or condition embodying the influence of student over student is seen in the fraternity. The fraternity is a unique exponent of college life; it represents more than any other element the expression of fellowship. College officers are now using, to an extent hitherto unknown, members in a fraternity to influence other members in the same fraternity. In a sense the fraternity is a college within a college. The bare value of the buildings of the fraternities at Cornell, at Yale, at Amherst, far exceeds the average endowment of the American college. This condition of good fellowship opens the way to the operation of all kinds of healthful and helpful influences. The perilous time in the life of a college man is his first year; if, in this time of peril, he can have a man who stands at the other and older end of the college course as his best friend, who himself is pure and strong and wise and tactful, he secures the best method for keeping himself in the way of truth, and of honest and good living. I know a student at Williams College who was at one time told that a classmate and fraternity associate of his would be obliged to leave college unless the derelict man could be taken as a room mate by the wiser and stronger one. He was so taken, and I have no reason to think that the wiser and stronger man was injured, though the younger and less strong man was helped.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The college officer should not, and seldom does, if ever, allow himself to employ unworthy means in discovering the ill deeds of students or in preventing students from doing such deeds. Not a few college men believe that college officers employ students whom they call "spies" to learn and to report the evil doings of students. I have never known of such methods being employed.

Nothing, therefore, can be more evident than that college officers believe it is comparatively useless to attempt to control by rules and regulations the conduct of college students. It is equally evident that through personal influence they may control the conduct and form the character of students. Upon this point I have recently read scores of letters from graduates of long standing and from many college officers. One of these writers, who is the chairman of the faculty of an old and conspicuous university, says:

"In my college days, which were passed at Hampden Sidney College, in this State, and at this university from 1868 to 1873, the control exercised by the officers of discipline was mainly through influence rather than through authority. There was never any espionage, but we were trusted to do what we knew to be right, and the sole effective check upon bad habits was found in the test offered by the college work.

"I believed then, and believe now, that it is not only wise, but necessary, to leave the college student to govern himself. Some will fall into error, some into vice, but it is a time in the life of a young man when his character needs the very discipline that is offered by this reliance upon his own powers of self-control. If at this period students are kept under constant surveillance, their characters are likely to be permanently distorted. All that can be done and ought to be done is to bring every salutary and uplifting influence to bear upon the student life, to offer legitimate and wholesome amusements as rivals of those that are unhealthy and illicit, to encourage among the young men a feeling of personal pride and honor and self-respecting uprightness, to establish a public opinion among the students which frowns upon gross vice and all forms of dishonorable action; in other words, to make the college career in this way a moral gymnastic and create out of the college student a worthy, honest, upright citizen."

Another, an able lawyer, a graduate of the University of Michigan, writes:

"It was my fortune to spend two years in a New England college having about two hundred students, entering Michigan University at the beginning of my Junior year. At the former institution students were subjected to a close watch—tutors and professors rooming in the same dormitories with the pupils, the attendance upon chapel and church being reported by monitors. Notwithstanding this oversight, or on account of it, no opportunity was lost on the part of the boys of giving vent to their ani-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mal spirits. Half-dressed attendance at early chapel, and summer nights made hideous by the horn blowing of ghost-clad boys on the roofs of the dormitories, together with the dangerous practice of hazing, often accompanied by a rain of stones, like a hail storm, demolishing scores of panes of glass, remain as vivid pictures in my mental gallery.

"Upon entering the University of Michigan I found there were no dormitories; the marking system had been abolished; there were no class honors or rivalries for prizes. But what was entirely new to me was an intellectual atmosphere and the spirit of earnest work that pervaded the university town, and this gives me an opportunity to answer, in a general way, the larger number of your questions.

"Our president and faculty succeeded in interesting the students in their work; the numbers were large and there was a strong current in the direction of earnest application which seemed to carry every one with it. A number of our professors were making discoveries and original investigations and were publishing books upon their various specialties. The works on spherical trigonometry and calculus that were afterward published by Prof. Olney were used in manuscript in our class and in the form of lectures. It is unnecessary to say that there were no ponies or diminutive books on shirt cuffs. Prof. Watson was frequently "bagging an asteroid." Prof. Cocker's *Christianity and Greek Philosophy* was just out and placed as a text book in the hands of the senior class and Cooley's *Constitutional Limitations* was giving him and the university a name on both sides of the ocean. In other words, the university was not conducted as a military post where boys were instructed to do some definite things and continually warned not to do other specific things, but all alike, faculty and students, seemed to be under the same law and striving for a common object. The moral as well as the intellectual life of the students was on a much higher plane than at the college which was governed by stricter rules."

Another, a physician in St. Paul, writes:

"Last summer I was in Cambridge for a week. I roomed in the college buildings and took my meals in the Memorial Hall. It was the week of Class Day, when nearly all the college students had finished their college duties; and if the Devil finds work for idle hands, here was a first-class opportunity. During that week I failed to see a single act that the most critical observer could censure.

"A few days later I was for a few hours at another institution, noted for its strictness, and I confess I saw a good deal of rowdyism. Harvard has practically no laws; the other has a statute book full of them. I think I may be regarded as an impartial observer, for I am not a graduate of either of the colleges that I have mentioned."

Such testimonies I might greatly multiply, but all such testimonies that I might cite would be evidence to prove this point; that it is useless for the American college to attempt to control conduct by rules; it is worse than useless; and further, it is of abounding value in the American college to attempt to control conduct and to form character through personal relationships and through the necessity of hard work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Has the college the right to demand of students personal conduct which the homes from which students come, and to which they still belong though in college do not demand. It may be at once said that the college has the right, abstract and absolute, to make any demand which it sees fit to make. The college is usually a private corporation, although in certain large relations it is a public trust, and therefore it may do whatsoever seemeth to itself good. But a college never interprets its rights in such a hard and fast way. It holds its powers in trust for the people, and it wishes to use its powers so that the good of the people may be promoted. Yet the president of one college writes to me defending the right of the college to exact from students, in the matter of drinking for instance, conduct not required in their homes, on the ground, (1.) that a college ought to have a higher standard of life than many homes, (2.) that college life is beset by special temptations, and (3.) that in their homes young men are surrounded by older friends and little children. They are in their homes to be compared to grains of powder scattered through a barrel of sawdust, while in college the inflammable material is sifted out from the community and put by itself, so that special vigilance is required to prevent excess. A graduate of Amherst, himself a distinguished clergyman of the Congregational Church, writes: "No college can afford to lower its moral requirements to please anybody, and it cannot afford to imperil its students by allowing any who followed evil practices at home to indulge in them during their college life." Another graduate also writes in a bold spirit that: "The college has the right to demand of students, in the matter of drinking for instance, conduct not required in the home if the college has, or proposes to have, any character itself. If the student smokes, drinks or swears at home, *a fortiori* he ought to be taught better in college."

A professor in a New England college says:

"I think the deterioration in college life due to the change in the community. Cards and spreads were not countenanced in old times, and the same was true of dancing, smoking, and social evils. I believe cards hurt our students worse than all else put together, but even the ministers of to-day are expert at whist, certainly the professors. The country is wealthy, and it is the rich people that bring these evils upon us. It is not that I consider cards, dancing, and smoking wrong, but they take away interest in study; you cannot prohibit them; you must rely upon moral suasion. Do not appoint professors who think more of these things than of their studies. Encourage Y. M. C. A. and healthful exercise."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another graduate, who is at the head of one of the great missionary boards of one of the great churches, says:

"If the conduct of a student is such as to affect unhappily the character of the college, I should say that the college had the right by all means to exact from that student different conduct, whatever his home life may be. I feel that our colleges should show a life and character with more sinew than can be found in a great many of our homes."

Further testimony is derived from another graduate of Amherst College who is also at the head of one of the great home missionary organizations:

"I should hold the opinion that the college has the right to require of students conduct which may not be demanded in their homes, in so far as the welfare of the college seems to demand it. There are habits which may be allowed in the home, with the home influences around the boy, which may not be allowed with safety in college when the boy is out from under the watch and care of parents."

But, on the other side, it is said that colleges have no right to exact from their students conduct which their homes do not demand. The judge of the Probate Court and Court of Insolvency of one of the large counties of Massachusetts writes:

"Colleges should not exact total abstinence from drinking, smoking, card playing, dancing and other things not wrong *per se*. The professor of hygiene may lecture on the evils of excess in any of these habits, but the college should not interfere unless such habits prevent the student's attaining the minimum standard of scholarship and deportment."

A professor in a divinity school says:

"I think that the college has the right to have its own standard of personal conduct irrespective of the home habits of students, but I should hesitate to make that a punishable offence which in the best (morally best) society was looked upon as a thoroughly innocent indulgence. The expressed wish of a parent in such matters would seem to be entitled to some consideration. When I was a member of the faculty of Antioch College under the presidency of Horace Mann, the habit of profane swearing was made a bar to graduation and card playing by the students was prohibited, but Mr. Mann attempted in general the maintenance of a higher ethical standard among his students than has been thought feasible in most other colleges. It must be confessed that in these efforts he was in no small degree successful."

A gentleman, himself able and distinguished and the son and grandson of able and distinguished statesmen, writes upon this point saying:

"All the college has the right to exact from the students in the matter of drinking, for example, is a fair degree of temperance and respect for the public. Exceptional cases of disorder should be ruthlessly weeded out. Except where these cases appear the students should be allowed to conduct themselves in such way as they see fit."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An eminent professor in an eminent law school says:

"Certain rules as to conduct, *e. g.* against the keeping of wines or liquors in college rooms, may be permissible, though I think such prohibitions should be established with caution; but I should think any attempt to denounce as immoral practices which students have been in the habit of seeing indulged in by the persons whom they most respect in the community in which they have lived, such as smoking, drinking, card-playing, however well intended such denunciations be, would be pretty certain to have an evil result."

And also, a distinguished citizen of Boston a short time before his death wrote as follows:

"Several rules tending to good conduct, as, for example, the forbidding of the use of liquor in college rooms, would seem proper, as showing the opinion and influence of the college on the subject, but in a general way one of the most important objects is to teach the students self-restraint and self government rather than to make them correct by compulsion. It has been discovered that students entering from the most precise and closely regulated schools are, in the largest proportion, 'wild' when they get to college."

I have thus at length set forth opposite opinions respecting the right of the college to exact of students methods of conduct which their homes do not demand. The general question, the two sides of which are thus set forth through these testimonies, has its quickest application to the question of the use of liquors. Shall the college endeavor to promote total abstinence among its students, or shall it endeavor to promote what is literally called temperance; in other words, shall it through the practice of its officers indicate that it is well, if they so desire, for men to partake temperately of liquor, or shall it, through the example and practice of its professors, indicate that total abstinence is the only rule for the highest type of self-respecting gentlemen? Upon this point I can have no question, but that the best rule for the American college, through the person of its officers, to set is the example of total abstinence. The only reason for this judgment, to which I now refer, lies in the fact that the *reputation* of a college as favoring the most temperate indulgence in liquor by its officers hurts that college in the judgment of a large body of the American people. Whether with reason or without reason, many homes would decline to send their sons to colleges which do possess this reputation. It is the duty of the officers of a college to see to it that in every possible way the reputation of that college shall be of the worthiest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I was riding a little while ago in the smoking room of a car and a distinguished gentleman, a professor in a very conspicuous American college, coming into the smoking room, lit his cigar. He at once said to me, "I suppose you do not object to my smoking." Of course I replied in the negative. But he added, "I suppose you do not smoke." I also said I did not, and I enquired, "I am interested to know why you say, 'I *suppose* you do not smoke.'" His answer was, "I think a college president should not smoke." The reasons which would lead my distinguished friend to the opinion that the college president should not smoke would also lead him to think that the college president should not drink.

But upon this point a college may prefer to make its own choice; it may prefer to minister only to those who do wish their children to be brought up in the temperate use of liquors. If a father wish his boy to be brought up in the temperate use of liquor, it is fitting for him to send his son to a college in which the temperate use of liquor is promoted.

I suppose it must be said that there is no method by which every boy going to college can be saved from evil. In any system of moral government it is apparently true that some will make evil choices and must suffer the results of such choices. In any system of college government it is probably true that some will go to the bad. But these results occurring in the colleges do not at all militate against a free and large treatment of individual students. On the whole, it is apparently the rule to give to men freedom, even though freedom will be to some a very expensive and destructive luxury, rather than to make all men puppets and nonentities. Let rather the American college believe that its students come to its halls with high purposes, with characters directed toward righteousness, eager to learn the truth, susceptible to personal influences, and willing to lend themselves to the best relationships of the college. The life that the students live in such an atmosphere is the best life itself and is also the preparation for the best life.

With each passing generation the freedom belonging to the American college student increases. It ought to increase, for the college students of to-day are better men than the college students of thirty and forty years ago. A professor in Johns Hopkins University, writing of his own college, Amherst, says:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"College life nowadays seems to me more healthy than it was in my student days. I ascribe the fact to the gradual blending of student life with a larger social life, which is always saner and sounder than that of monastic communities and college halls, where young men are thought to be secluded from the world. Old-time college life was barbaric and uncivilized compared with that of the outside world. The sooner students are taught to be citizens and members of society the better it will be for colleges and for the country. I think the highest type of education is to be found only in a city university, where the student is in the world, but not of it. The country college is perhaps better for boys and for athletics, but country seclusion is by no means an ideal condition for student morals."

A friend, writing to me of his college, says that after a careful observation of his own class he had come to the conclusion that 85 per cent. of his class-mates were morally clean. Twenty years ago I know that hardly 50 per cent. of the men in the senior class were morally clean; the change has been great and in every respect salutary.

The newspapers teem from time to time with reports of the frolics and escapades or the deviltries, sins, and crimes of college boys. Such reports are usually exaggerations; but it is to be at once said that the personal morals of college men are far superior to the personal morals of any body of young men of equal size outside of the college. A distinguished graduate of Harvard writes me saying:

"The moral tone of college life among the students in my day was, to the best of my judgment, distinctly better than the moral tone of young men of the same age outside of college walls. There were dissipated young men there then, as there are dissipated young men there now; but the dissipation of young men outside of the college walls was in my judgment distinctly lower, more vulgar, and more degrading than that of those inside of them."

A professor in the College of Iowa says:

"As a teacher during forty-five years, I must say that the average student is noticeably superior to the non-student in life and in character. Were this not so I should be tempted to the most profound pessimism; as it is, however, I am able to indulge only in the most cheerful optimism."

The college man is none too good, but he is growing better with each passing generation. He now represents the highest type of young manhood. He will continue to grow better with each passing generation; he will embody a yet finer and nobler type of manhood. Worthy freedom under worthy conditions represents the best method and agency.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PATRIOTISM: ITS DEFECTS, ITS DANGERS AND ITS DUTIES.

BY THE RIGHT REV. WILLIAM CROSWELL DOANE,
BISHOP OF ALBANY.

THERE must be some confusion, in the application at least, of this great word if, on the one hand, it can be called, as it ought to be, the highest civic virtue and the noblest earthly motive, while on the other, there can be truth in Johnson's famous epigram, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." And the confusion arises partly from the complex character of the thought, and partly from the gross misuse of the word. The thought is complex plainly. Probably its most concrete expression is in the well-known lines of Sir Walter Scott:

> "Breathes there a man with soul so dead
> Who never to himself hath said
> 'This is my own, my native land?'"

But what about the splendid array of colonial representatives in the Queen's Jubilee procession, brimming over with enthusiasm for an empire which counts among its subjects people born under every sky, people who began their lives as subjects of other sovereigns and citizens of other states? And what about this composite citizenship of our own, so largely composed of men of "all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues"? What is the *patria* in which these are the patriots? It is not the native land, it is not always the land of adoption. For sometimes, as one said about a church with an unpopular rector, which had discarded pew rents and taken to the offertory system for maintenance, "this church is supported by *in*voluntary contributions," the British patriots of to-day became such in many instances very involuntarily, at the beginning. The fact is, that the difficulty in defining a patriot begins with the difficulty of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defining *patria*—the Fatherland, as the Germans translate, the mother country, as we rather say in English. Whether it means the country that fathers or mothers us, or the country of our fathers and mothers, depends upon circumstances. The native land, literally, is, of course, the latter, the land in which we were born. And the real instinct of patriotism finds its first place and finest reason there.

The Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, in a very noble speech at Glasgow, on the occasion of his installation as Lord Rector of the University, makes some curious statements as to the etymology of the word "patriot," which we use so freely and with such various meanings now. Dr. Murray, the editor of the new English Dictionary, is his authority for saying that the word is French in its origin and belongs to the fifteenth century, when, however, it meant simply a citizen. In the English literature of the sixteenth century it occurs, but always qualified with an adjective describing the kind of citizen it meant. The translators of the King James version in the seventeenth century use it, as does Milton, in this way, with "good" or "worthy" before it. And Dryden first gave it its specific meaning as needing no qualification whatever :

"A patriot's all-atoning name."

The question is whether it is a safe word to use now, without a qualifying adjective; whether there are not bad and unworthy patriots so-called, as well as good and worthy. Certainly when one traces the word back to France, realizes that it meant "citizen," and then remembers what that word stood for in the leveling and lowering horrors of the French Revolution, one feels inclined to doubt whether a patriot, *per se*, especially whether a patriot, *a se*—self-styled, that is—is absolutely the best citizen.

Mr. Chamberlain says that "the sentiment of patriotism must be found in something more than attachment to the soil, which might be attributed to a fungus. It depends on the pursuit of common interests, the defence of a common independence and the love of common liberties. It is strengthened by a common history and common traditions, and it is part of a national character formed under these conditions." Dr. Huntington's definition of nationality in his Bedell lectures for 1897 lies along the same line. "The three all important notes of nationality are polity, territory, sovereignty. There must be discipline, there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be area, there must be independence. A nation is a people organized under one civil polity, established upon a definite territory, and possessed of sovereign power." But Mr. Chamberlain qualifies his definition in a way that seems to me somewhat dangerous and destructive of the finer thought. "Patriotism," he says, "implies an *exclusive* preference." But why exclusive?

There is a grand statement about this question in the book which contains for some of us authoritative truth: "God has made of *one* (*blood* being only a suggestive definition of the manner of the unity of man), God has made of *one* all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed (or their appointed seasons) and the bounds of their habitation." Certainly this means a unity of peoples in the purpose of God; and His further purpose in their distribution over the face of the earth, within the bounds of their habitation. By whatever means, of conquest, of eradication, of commingling, the bounds of the habitations of man are allotted, or at least allowed, by God. And through all distances, divisions, diversities, there is behind everything a unity of the human race,—a common origin which cannot be left out of account; a "parliament of man, the federation of the world." I do not dwell upon the more sacred knitting together wrought out in the redemption of the whole by the *one* Blood of Jesus Christ. It is enough to insist upon the oneness by the one creation, made closer by the oneness in the Incarnation, when whole humanity was taken in to God.

Mr. Chamberlain says very truly that "a vague attachment to the human race is a poor substitute for the performance of the duties of a citizen, and professions of universal philanthropy afford no excuse for neglecting the interests of one's own country." He illustrates this point by the followers of the Frenchmen (*spectre chimeras*, Carlyle calls them, who flit squeaking and gibbering until oblivion swallows them) who in the early days of the French Revolution "welcomed the human race to their Constituent Assembly." These are the men, it is to be remembered, from whom we get the word "patriot," and who dishonored its synonym of "citizen." Is it necessary to make the antithesis? Are the two terms antagonistic? Is not the love of man, "philanthropy," consistent with the love of country, "patriotism"? Must the preference be *exclusive*? My conten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is that the one is larger than the other, that the one is above the other, that the one is before the other, that the one is the foundation of the other; that the patriot is first philanthropist; that in the great brotherhood of humanity all are brothers, only those are nearest who are in the same home. Patriotism is the stronger passion because it is centered upon a narrow sphere; just as a man's love for his family is intensified within the limits of his home, although the instinct of love for fellowmen is not only not crowded out, but is kept warmer by his home affections.

Preference there will be and ought to be, but not *exclusive* preference. What else but perpetual irritations can result from the absorbing concentration of all interests and affections, which forgets all others but its own? What sound or safe sentiment can be founded upon selfishness? What clear outlook into the broad atmosphere of duty can be had, that is shut in by so narrow a horizon? I am not specially fond of the word "altruism," but it seems to mean something to some people that no other word expresses; and if nations are masses of individuals, governed and controlled by the same great moral principles, it must be that national selfishness is a sin. Back of all lies the truth, I believe, that there are certain common interests of humanity which must be considered; that the advancement of one at the expense of another means in the long run harm and loss to all. There is, to a degree at least, such interdependence among the various nations of the earth, for instance in the interchange of the different commodities and products, as to make possible the application of the argument from diversity of membership in the human body. "If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it." This seems plainly written in the diversities of products in different countries—tea and tobacco, cotton and wheat, coffee and sugar. What one needs another supplies. No one is self-sufficient.

But if, exclusively, the patriot must disregard all countries but one, we have simply a set of divisions of men arrayed each one against the other, which must result in a series of political Chinese walls. The true patriot is, first of all, a man, one of the great brotherhood of humanity, knit in, in the mere matter of self-interest, with the human race. And this knitting in becomes more and more intense. So closely are we tied to-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gether the world over, that the earth quivers from pole to pole when a blow is struck at the equator. The reticulation of electric wires is a very network of nerves, thrilling from one end of the earth to the other. And the intertwining of commercial relations, the touchy question of investments in stocks and bonds, make Wall Street and Chicago related to the old lady of Threadneedle Street, with a blood relationship of that kind which seems to be "thicker than water" or anything else; by which the financial pulse of the world is quickened or retarded. This is the mere material and monetary reason of self-interest; but in the long run battening on the adversity of another nation impoverished by war, by failure of crops, by any misfortune, does not fatten any nation in a healthy way. Patriotism is inclusive preference rather than exclusive.

But it is preference, and it ought to be, with the intensest, extremest jealousy of affection. Let me point out some of its dangers and difficulties. In the first place, let it be broadly said that the hatred of other countries is, not only not the only sign, but it is no sign at all, of the love of our own. It is neither necessary nor natural for a man to show his love for his mother or his wife or his daughter, by being a misogynist in his feeling toward all other women in the world. On the contrary, all womanhood, whose ideal is realized to him in these dearer relations, takes on more dignity and more attractiveness in his eyes. Our own national pride and affection ought to lead to respect for all other patriotism; ought to breed kindly feeling toward every country which inspires similar feelings in her citizens. National rivalries, national jealousies, must be and will be; and they are more natural and more keenly felt between nations of similar civilizations. But that a man must hate any other country in order to show his love for his own, or that the love of the one is shown at all by the hatred of the other, is false to nature and to reason.

Of all so-called patriotic hatreds the attempt to foster American hatred of England is the most unpardonable and the most unnatural. When one recalls the obstinacy of George III. and Lord North in their stupid and tyrannical treatment of the American colonies in the eighteenth century, the first thing to realize is, that that was settled more than a century ago, and is an issue too long dead and buried to be worth digging up to-day. The outcome was for us the splendid establishment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this government by a series of heroic deeds and by the assertion of great principles of justice, which have lifted us to the proud position of England's rival and England's equal, in all that makes for national greatness. And the outcome for England was the wisdom which Pitt and Fox and Burke contended for one hundred years ago, and which great numbers of the Englishmen of that day believed in; namely, that England has been taught the lesson of colonial government which has signalized her career since she rallied from the blunders of that administration, by the establishment of an empire girdling the world with colonies and colonial governments, tied together, as this last Jubilee has shown, with bands of steel, with the cords of a man, with the nerves of love. She has certainly, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier said, "the art of governing," and she learned it largely by her experience with us. But the Stamp Act and the Boston Tea Party are things of the past and not of the present. We rejoice in the liberty which was won by very force of these oppressions. We remember them to the honour and glory of the wise and brave men who resisted this tyrannical folly, and sealed their resistance, not by cheap words of bitterness, but by brave words and braver deeds of courage and heroism. We recognize them as the pointing fingers of that providential purpose, by which God led men who put their trust in Him to carve out with the sword the independence of America. We realize that by them God "hastened in His time" the inevitable separation of this great nation from any sovereignty but its own. But to recall them to-day for the sake of creating or continuing prejudice and dislike against the England of to-day, with her splendid triumphs of imperial extension and colonial administration, on the part of the America of to-day, with her glorious development of power, is an act whose wickedness is only equalled by its folly. Surely we have learned some lessons about this nearer home. No greater bitterness ever existed than the bitterness of our own civil war. No grosser cruelties were ever charged in any war by each side upon the other. The men who fought these battles, and the great President under whom the government was preserved, pre-eminently Lincoln and Grant, were the first to set the example and to urge the importance of wiping out all painful memories, and so far as possible blotting out all monuments that could perpetuate the horrors of that fratricidal war. And yet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there is no lack of honour done to the brave men who won the battles of the Union.

The Hon. A. Oakey Hall, once Mayor of New York, after a seven years' residence in London, says that he holds "as utter detestation of the British government as *any Irishman* holds." Most people who know the facts would be led to distrust his judgment of the historic empire of England, from his distorted estimate of the historic Church of England, that it "was founded on the lust of Henry VIII., as well as of a recreant monk, Luther, and an apostate nun." But the dangerousness of this misjudgment is in the words in which he sums up the extreme possibility of detestation, "as much as any Irishman." This is a flavor of the old Tweed days, and I am sorry to say it is a flavor to which we have been treated rather *ad nauseam*. A paper called the *Irish Republic* speaks of England as the "arch enemy of this country and the sneak-thief of the world." The Knights of Labor, with a strong suspicion of this same tattered passion, describe England as "a coward in her dealings with nations who are her equals, and as a vindictive oppressor and exterminator of those nations and peoples over which she can dominate with impunity." The *Irish World* quotes from a Chicago paper twice in the same number, at length, the statement that "England bullied us when we were harassed and threatened us when we were in trouble and abused and slandered us in season and out of season." At the first reading, this is rather amusing. It is so bombastic, so overdone, so like the ranting of a poor actor, so vulgar, so violent, so exactly like the British jingo in the concert halls of London, that the inclination is to toss it into the waste-paper basket with a smile. But the trouble with it is that it masks itself behind the name of American patriotism, when it is nothing in the wide world but a nursing of an old grudge, racial and religious.

I am not saying that an Irishman in Ireland had not grievances and has not grievances against the government of England; but when he attempts to infect with his old sores the country that has harbored him and given him freedom from English oppression it ceases to be amusing and becomes matter of serious concern.

It is of the first essence of patriotism that it should beget a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race of citizens amalgamated into a community of sentiment. The phrases that are very frequent in the mouths of men, classifying Americans by a qualifying adjective of a national sort, are destructive of the best hopes of America. Partly because of youngness, partly because of the composite character of our population, we are still in the process of forming, as a nation. We have great evils to contend with in unrestricted immigration and in the operation of universal suffrage. The former may perhaps be controlled by the very demand of those who immigrated to us a good while ago, and find themselves either ousted from work or reduced in wages by the overplus of labor. The latter is harder to correct. If we could have *real* American manhood suffrage, a vote, that is, of no man who has not been an American for 21 years, either from his birth or from his arrival, a great evil would be cured. Meanwhile, recognizing our indebtedness to the toil of the Irishman and the thrift of the German immigrant, and realizing the splendid service that foreign-born people rendered in the Civil War, there ought to be impressed upon them the fact that we are all and only Americans; that patriotism is a positive and not a controversial sentiment; that distinguishing epithets and divided interests ought to be laid aside; and that the hatreds and hostilities with which, as living Americans today, we are not concerned, ought to be buried and forgotten.

I have dwelt upon this anglophobia for two reasons: First, because it is the most prominent form of this mistaken patriotism, this "exclusive preference," which measures love of one's own country by hatred of another; and, in the next place, because, more than any other hatred, it is the most unnatural and the most un-American sentiment. It is quite true that, if the census of descent were taken as the test, the sons or descendants of Englishmen by no means make up the majority of American citizens. But there is descent other than that of birth and a lineage beside that of blood. The unity of language, literature, and law between England and America is a threefold cord that cannot be broken. To have our English Bible, our English Shakespeare, our English Blackstone all absolutely American in reverence and influence outweighs, outvotes and overwhelms all questions of racial compositeness. And I am quite sure that this is the English feeling more and more. With the large mass of English people the oppression of our colonies was un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular a century ago. Men who were starving and out of work by thousands, because there was no cotton to be had from America, nevertheless were strong sympathizers with the Union in the Civil War. The suggestion of forcible insistence in Mr. Cleveland's Venezuelan message stirred but one common feeling of horror and surprise throughout England, while at the same time the intrusion of advice from the German Emperor was instantly and angrily denounced. Hasty and violent utterances in newspapers break out from time to time on both sides of the water. But the better class of English papers are restrained and, in the main, just in their recognition of American rights and principles. The loving words of Tennyson express the real feeling and the right relation between England and America:

"Gigantic daughter of the West,
We drink to thee across the flood.
We know thee most, we love thee best,
For art thou not of British blood?
Should war's mad blast again be blown,
Permit not thou the tyrant powers
To fight thy mother here alone,
But let thy broadsides roar with ours.
Hands all round!
God the tyrant's cause confound!
To our great kinsmen of the West, my friends,
To the great name of England round and round!"

And while true patriotism does not consist *in* and does not consist *with* contempt and dislike for other countries, it does not consist in boastful blindness about the faults of our country and our government. True love is never blind. The truest love sees, with its searching intimacy of sight, that so it may correct and cure the faults in what it loves best on earth. "It is not fair," Mr. Chamberlain says, "to condemn patriotism because it sometimes degenerates into mad jingoism or into the misplaced sentiment, 'my country right or wrong.'" It is not courage but cowardice that makes a blustering braggart of an individual, and this is just the element that marks the jingo in national feeling. Seen in other people, it is odious even in the eyes of those who are tainted with it themselves. The latest explosion of it in the German Emperor and his brother Henry has filled the world with laughter, not only at the inconsistency which demands, at the cannon's mouth, protection in China for the men whom Germany has banished from her own soil; nor only at the thin veiling of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the commercial purpose under cover of the advancement of religion, "the naked statement," the *Guardian* calls it, of the alternative between a coaling station and the Cross; but still more at its self-consequential assertion, "to declare in foreign lands," Prince Henry said to his brother, "to declare in foreign lands the gospel of your Majesty's hallowed person, to preach it to everyone who will hear it, and also to those who will not hear it. This gospel I will have inscribed upon my banner, and I will inscribe it whithersoever I go." One instinctively distrusts a man's own confidence in his loyalty or in his honesty, or in his purity, if he boasts of it perpetually.

Over against this class of men are two sorts of citizens. First, the people who see and seek to cure the defects or faults in their own government, to advance, that is to say, the best interests of their country by removing from it whatever hinders them. Mr. Chamberlain calls this class of people in Great Britain "Little Englanders," who argue for "a Little England policy of surrender," as against the imperial policy of expansion and extension, who make it their business "to look for specks of mud on the imperial mantle." No man ever plays this *rôle* without making himself offensive and objectionable to his neighbors, or without the risk of becoming something of a prig and a Pharisee himself. Nevertheless, it is a fine phase of the finest patriotism. And the *Spectator's* criticism of the one omission in Mr. Chamberlain's address is well put and true.

"The man who sincerely believes that the nation is acting wickedly, and who has the courage to say so, may be mistaken in fact, but it cannot be denied that he is acting a patriotic part. If, indeed, his criticism is true, it would be impossible to exaggerate the debt of gratitude which the nation owes him. Mr. Chamberlain would be the first to admit that Wilberforce's crusade against the slave trade was the work of a great patriot; yet many men in his day condemned him as a meddling sentimentalist who wanted to injure his country. . . . At the same time, let us never refuse the praise of patriotism to those who do their best to keep our rule above suspicion. It is of course very irritating to be told that there is a speck of dirt on the imperial ermine, to hear that this corner of the mantle is trailing in the mud, or that the edge is frayed in one place and rotten in another, but, all the same, those who point out these defects are doing good work, and unless we heed them, our robe of state will become so soiled and tattered as to be a disgrace rather than a glory."

Sorest and most serious of all these dangerous things that are mistaken for patriotism, however, are partisanship, and what I may perhaps be pardoned for calling "politicianism." Even at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times when great questions of state become the basis of party organization, men are easily blinded into thinking that the interests of their party and the interests of the nation are convertible terms. And when blind devotion to a country means really blind devotion to a party, the worst result has been attained. The peril is enhanced under such conditions as exist in America today, when no really great political questions divide the two great parties; when there are gold Democrats and silver Republicans, and *vice versa*; when the tariff can hardly be said to make any clear-cut line of separation; when the main difference is between the ins and the outs; when the old description is realized that "party is the madness of the many, for the profit of the few;" when offices and their spoils are the chief ends in view; when personal ownership takes the place of party leadership; when discontent and individual differences hinder the executive from executing the will of the people who elected him; and when the will of a majority of voters is not certain to be expressed by the votes of those whom they have chosen to represent them. Partisanship is never patriotism, because true patriotism cannot be partisan. West against East, North against South, class legislation, agitations of labour to depress capital or of capitalists to oppress the labourer, all antagonisms of citizen against citizen, sectional, local, or of different classes and conditions, are unpatriotic because they hurt the country. And honest as the *mere* party man may be, he is no safe guide, because neither virtue nor wisdom nor loyalty is exclusively the property of any single party anywhere. Over and over again the safest and soundest party is the one not in power; and the progress of a state is like the propelling power of a man in walking—one foot after another.

Worse than partisanship, even, is the dangerous element of what are called practical politics, the theories and methods of the professional politician. The accepted degradation of this word is a sad sign of the times. It has, derivatively and inherently, a higher source and a nobler meaning than patriotism. Seeming at first sight to be narrower, it must be interpreted upon the fact that the "polis" is the state, which would mean that the politician is the statesman. The suggestion of such a synonym is a sufficient comment on the deterioration of the thought; because the words are poles apart in "the modern instance" of the professional politician. It means a man, nowa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days, who adopts as a means of livelihood the management of primaries, the running of elections, the distribution of the spoils. And yet politics ought to be a profession in the best sense of the word. And there is no harm—on the contrary, it is eminently legitimate—in a man's making his living out of it. But the livelihood ought not to be the only or the first purpose, in this or any other profession. And it ought to set itself at higher things than the mere manipulation of voters. Its preliminary studies and its preparatory training ought to be, not in the arts of the demagogue, the tricks of the ward-manager, or the skill of the wire-puller, but in the great principles of government; in sociology; in the problems of labour, of sanitation, of municipal administration; in diplomacy, in international law, in the great movements and concerns of organized life.

Wisest and best of all the marks of a true patriot is the possession and the practice of an intelligent interest in the public affairs of his country. Hopeless in the face of the overwhelming majorities of selfish and self-seeking masses of men, blindly following a leader to whom they hand over the exercise of what is supposed to be their will as expressed by votes, too many men of influence and character have withdrawn themselves from all concern in the administration of government. And it is the attitude of cowardice and immorality. Conspicuous instances of failure in the attempt to bring about a better condition of political management are no doubt most discouraging; but ultimate and not immediate success is the wise expectation of thoughtful men. And, meanwhile, no forlorn hope was ever led by the kind of man who loses heart in the face or in the fear of failure. And more than that, personal duty is not measured by this rule. A man owes to his country even his life, if the sacrifice is demanded; and he owes the service of his time, his intelligence, his interest, his participation in her public affairs.

It is not merely that political conditions personally affect every citizen, but it is more than this, that every branch of occupation in life can lend something to their improvement. The clergyman owes the influence of his religion and his ethical standards; the physician, his knowledge of the laws of health; the lawyer, his familiarity with legal principles; the tradesman, his experience in commercial interests; the farmer, the engineer, the labourer, their knowledge of agriculture, and mines, and rail-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ways, and toil. And to withhold his contribution to the common stock of influence for what is wise and right is an injury to the self-interest of the man and an injustice to the state in which he is a citizen. "Patriotism," Mr. Chamberlain says, "involves the idea of personal sacrifice. Our obligations do not end with obedience to the laws and the payment of taxes. We give an additional proof of patriotism in taking our full share of public work and responsibility, including the performance of those municipal obligations, on the due fulfilment of which the comfort, the health, and the lives of the community so largely depend." "And again, if the country is to be what men think it is and know it ought to be, the result can only be reached by a general display of public spirit, by the contribution of all to the common good, and by efforts to develop the noble side of national character, and to cure its defects." It is this thought, "the common good," that is expressed in that fine old name, "the commonwealth," which does not contain the vulgar suggestion of mere possessions, but the higher ideal of the common weal—the common good. This is the true aim and the true ambition of the patriot. Not limited in its largest thought to the *patria*, its duties and its desires will, nevertheless, centre themselves there. Even Mr. Chamberlain's *exclusive* preference confesses that "it should not involve the injury of others, but only that each nation may legitimately strive to become richer, stronger, greater."

Only let not these be mere material measures of comparison or of competition. There are riches not consisting in worldly wealth; there is strength not summed up in masses of martial power; there is greatness which is not mere bigness of territory or population. And the noblest strife among the nations of the world is to be *rich* in the arts and achievements of spiritual and intellectual power, *strong* in the might of justice and purity and honour, and great in the magnificent and magnanimous qualities, moral and civic, of Christian manhood. The cultivation of true patriotism will find its finest exercise of legitimate competition along such lines as these. And the great heritage which God has given to us Americans,—in the grandeur of our isolation from foreign entanglements; in the possession of a continental empire of unlimited extent and unseparated neighborhood; in the heritage of the ancestral examples of the founders of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republic, who stood for a liberty defined and defended by law; for an equality based on actual character and not on accidental birth; for a brotherhood of mutual duties and not of conflicting rights,—is our opportunity to accomplish these results. "Upon us it must devolve," as my father said to us in College forty-five years ago, in one of his masterly orations on the Fourth of July, "upon us it must devolve that as our history began it shall go on. The wisdom, the moderation, the integrity, the devotion, the self-denial, the self-sacrifice of seventeen hundred and seventy-six have made the opening chapters of our history as hard to emulate as they are worthy of our emulation. The eyes of the whole world are upon us. And we shall shame our sires and dispossess our sons if we permit one blot to fall upon the glorious page that chronicles the wars and brightens with the fame of Washington. A wisdom more than human inspired the counsels of the founders and framers of our government. The heavenly grace which Franklin urged them to invoke was freely poured upon their hearts. The Constitution of the United States after a trial of all these years, through all the vicissitudes of peace and war, of poverty and plenty, of prosperity and adversity, maintains its marvelous equipoise, expands with the expansion of our country, strengthens with the multiplication of our inhabitants, is equal to every emergency, is superior to every assault, spans our wide continent as one triumphal arch, laved at one base by the Atlantic and by the Pacific at the other, and sheds on millions of free men the light, the peace, the joy, the unity, the indivisibility of perfect freedom, to our children, and our children's children, and their children's children, an inheritance forever."

WM. CROSWELL DOANE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COULD RUSSIA TAKE BRITISH INDIA?*

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL ROGALLA VON BIEBERSTEIN, OF THE GERMAN ARMY.

THE steady progress of Russia in the direction of India through the extensive territories east of the Caspian Sea is about to receive a fresh impulse as well from the political development of the districts traversed by the Trans-Caspian Railway and its extensions and projected branches, as from the Russian advance up to the Pendjdeh River on the Pamir plateau. Not without reason is the great skill admired with which Russia assimilates all the semi-civilized peoples conquered by her. The Turkish and Mongolian tribes on the lower Don and the Volga have been merged in Russia for centuries, and even the inhabitants of the Caucasus are to-day good Russians, after a glorious war of defence of unexampled obstinacy which lasted more than fifty years. As is generally recognized, the Russian military colonies have played an effective part in this work of assimilation—their members, merchants or officials, materially contributing, through their Slavonic sociableness and by means of marriage connection, to the rapid Russification of the subjugated districts, while the Russian government at the same time endeavors to attract to her service, by conferring distinction upon them, the princely and other prominent persons in those newly acquired lands.

The construction of a railway, lately planned by Russia, across the Caucasus, from Vladikavkaz to Tiflis, whence the South Caucasian Railway already runs to Baku, a port from which Krasnovodsk, on the other side of the Caspian, can be reached in 20 hours, seems to be calculated not only to promote the development of the trans-Caucasian dominions of Russia, but, by accel-

* The following study has met with a favorable judgment from Lord Frederick Roberts, and was presented to Prince Bismarck and Count Caprivi by Professor Fürgen Bona Mayer, of the University of Bonn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erating the transport of Russian troops to these districts, to shorten and improve the strategical line of connection for an operation of Russia against India. This abbreviation of the route must be estimated at about two weeks, as the projected railway would save a march of about 150 kilometres through high mountains, and a double embarkation and disembarkation of the troops with their enormous baggage. It is but a short time, moreover, since a line was constructed from Vladikavkaz to Petrovsk on the Caspian, and thus a new line of communication was created with that military station, whence the passage across the Caspian to Krasnovodsk can be effected in about 40 hours.

The means of transportation at Russia's disposal for a passage of her troops across the Caspian consist not only of the six steamers of the Caspian fleet, but also of the numerous ships of the merchant fleet, among which are more than fifty large petroleum steamers. With such a flotilla, which could be reinforced by chartered ships, the Russian administration would be able, at the present moment, to meet the most extensive demands for the transport of immense masses of commissariat and military stores of every description. But in a Russian campaign against India in the future, the projected line through Persia, connecting Enzeli on the Caspian with Bushire on the Indian Ocean, would be of considerable significance, as by means of it the transport of Russia's troops between both seas might be accomplished within eight days. Of course a maritime operation of Russia against India in the Indian Ocean is out of the question, since the British fleet would render such a step impossible. At the same time railway connection might render it possible for Russia to conduct a special southern land operation against the district of the lower Indus, *via* Quetta, and thus cause the Russian attack on India to assume a more comprehensive character. The completion of the Euphrates railway and its connection with the Anatolian line would be far from enabling Russia to accomplish this purpose in the same degree, and she would be likely to meet greater opposition from Turkey as to the passage of troops than from Persia.

Even during the reigns of Catherine II. and Paul I. Russian acquisition of trans-Caspian territory had begun, first of all at the northeast of the Caspian Sea in the Kirghiz Steppe. Afterwards, in the reigns of Nicholas I., Alexander II., and Alexander III., they were constantly extended to the south and southeast.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There still remain as buffer states between Russia and British India, Afghanistan, and nominally the Khanate of Bokhara, which latter is manifestly under Russian control, and a small tract of the Pamir district. These states, however, Afghanistan perhaps excepted, do not form a serious obstacle to a Russian attack upon India, since they do not possess well organized military forces and are not protected by powerful guaranteeing governments close at hand interested in their integrity.

At present the Trans-Caspian Railway reaches Dushak on the Persian frontier, which is only about 240 miles from Herat, so that the sphere of Russian power has made considerable advance toward "The Gate of India." Dushak is, moreover, protected against any threatening of its communication by Persia (an eventuality which is by no means probable) by the incomparably strong Russian fortress of Kelati Nadiri.

The present condition of Russian Central Asia, Ferghana being excepted, as British travelers* describe it, is that of a very thinly populated and imperfectly cultivated region. This is the result of the lack of water and woods; and the retimbering of these districts would be an undertaking worthy of the enterprising spirit of their present rulers. The efforts of the Russians in this direction have been attended with the greatest success. At every station of any importance there are now to be found extensive plantations of young trees planned by them, and similar plantations are gradually to be laid out along the watercourses, where they will be protected from camels, goats, and other enemies of the vegetable kingdom.

Whatever may be the future value of their acquisitions, however, it is obvious that the Russians in their advance toward the Afghan frontier have gained little that so far is worth possessing. To use Skobeleff's expression, "the Asiatic skin is not as yet worth tanning." Nevertheless, the Russians retain the strategical advantages which arise from the advance positions they have secured, although it is doubtful whether their advance has been undertaken with that special object in view. Indeed, it is more probable that it has been forced upon them by circumstances, just as the gradual conquest of India became a necessity to the East India Company.

It must be clear to any one who is acquainted with the daily

* We follow C. E. Biddulph.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

requirements of even a small force of five to ten thousand men, in districts which can only supply the provisions necessary for the sustenance of the existing population, that the difficulty of providing for a force of only twenty to fifty thousand men, at any point of the present Russian frontier, can be surpassed only by the almost impossible task of continuously providing for them for an indeterminate period. The resources of the trans-Caspian district would be for a number of years very limited, but the Russian government will not be wanting in energy in developing them. Already several projects exist for the extension of irrigation and the introduction of all kinds of agricultural improvements, which must result in a considerable increase in the productiveness of these districts and a constant amelioration of the condition of their inhabitants. The most important factor in bringing this about will naturally be the Trans-Caspian Railway. As England has earned in India and other parts of her empire, the existence of a railway has a magical effect in creating order among the most turbulent and quarrelsome peoples; and, indeed, this has been the experience of Russia with the Turcomans and other inhabitants of the trans-Caspian region. As a matter of fact the whole of that district may now be considered as quiet and safe as any part of India. The prevailing order cannot be said to be due to the presence of a large number of troops. The Russian troops in Trans-Caspia, Bokhara and Turkestan—that is to say, in the military district of Turkestan—amount in time of peace to about 41,000 men, and the number on a war footing is about 53,000 men, which forces are distributed over a territory of about 1,459,823 square kilometres, that is to say, over an area three times the size of Germany. So secure is the Russian position amid the natives that the Trans-Caspian Railway is watched throughout its whole extent only by the few soldiers of railway troops. From what has been said it may be inferred that as a source of commissariat supply for a Russian army, operating against India, Trans-Caspia can hardly be taken into account for a long time, and that such an army would be obliged, before beginning the campaign, to establish large depots there.

Of the routes which lead from the Russian trans-Caspian provinces to India, the following are the only ones at present available for a Russian attack on India: First, that from Dushak

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

via Old Sarakhson the Heri Rud, and that from Merv by the Kushk Valley and Herat to Kabul; and, second, that *via* Herat-Kandahar to Quetta, or *via* Ghazni to Dera Ismail Khan on the Middle Indus.

These routes are decidedly preferable to all others for such an undertaking as a Russian attack against India. Owing to their comparative nearness to the Trans-Caspian Railway, they have far better connection with the rich provinces of south and middle Russia, and with the military resources of the garrisons of the Caucasus government. Other routes lead through so difficult a mountainous country, inhabited partly by the most warlike Afghan tribes, that their practicability for the passage of troops and the transport of war material is more than questionable. Besides, the road to Herat is a comparatively easy one, and for part of its course traverses fertile country.

After the march of some 240 miles from Dushak to Herat, the district of Herat, itself one of the most fertile and populous Asiatic valleys, in which the commercial highways of Kabul, Balkh, Bokhara, Khiva, Meshed, Ispahan, Seistan, and Kandahar meet, would afford a new basis for the Russian attacking army, where it could collect its forces, let them rest, and gather their commissariat stores and their military material in preparation for the actual attack upon India. In addition to this the Russian march to Herat might take place in two main lines by Old Sarakhs and, the very probable consent of Persia being presupposed, by Meshed. Should Persia withhold her consent to the use of the Meshed route, Russia must be satisfied with the routes by Old Sarakhs and the Murghab and Kushk valleys.

In view of the immense distances to be overcome by a Russian army attacking British India, the necessity of an intermediate base of operations, such as Herat would supply, is obvious. If Russia were permitted, however, to march through Persia, she would be able, having as her base Trans-Caucasia and the maritime stations of Baku and Ashurada on the Caspian, to take the second line of march, that, namely, by Astrabad, Bostan, and Meshed to Herat, which passes through the northern part of Khorassan, which is extremely fertile and abounds in beasts of burden. It is true that this route is devoid of the means of railway transportation and that it is some 550 miles long. Nevertheless it might be of considerable value for Russian operations,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the column using it, starting considerably in advance, would proceed from Ashurada *via* Meshed upon Herat and would appear in the district of Herat simultaneously with the column moving by railway and the northern routes—a junction which might be of great importance, especially in the improbable event of simultaneous offensive action of the Indian forces through Afghanistan. The use of this second line of advance to Herat would be of great importance for the supply of the immense war material which the attack on India would necessitate.

The two lines of advance practicable for a Russian attack upon India from Herat are on the north the routes by Kabul to Peshawur, and on the south by Kandahar to Pishin and Quetta, or from Kandahar by Ghazni to Dera Ismail Khan on the middle Indus. The northern line of advance, counting from Herat, is about 550 miles long as the crow flies, and, according to Lord Chelmsford, 784 miles throughout its whole extent to the Indus. It leads through the fertile valley of the Heri Rud, over the passes of the wild Hazara mountains (three thousand metres high) and then through the valley of the Kabul River (two thousand metres). This route has been hitherto used in its whole extent only by Asiatic armies; but it is to be assumed with certainty that it is passable for vehicles, and therefore practicable, though difficult, for artillery. In consideration of its mountainous character, three to three and a half months must be allowed for it, especially because of the enormous baggage which a Russian army would be compelled to take with it in these regions, which afford sufficient forage but insufficient sustenance for the troops. One camel is reckoned as means of transport for every kind of military requirements for three men.

The route from Herat by Kandahar to Quetta, being shorter (only 650 miles long) and the more convenient, may be traversed in from two to two and a half months. But, supposing it possible for Russia to form two sufficiently strong attacking columns, while an army advancing by the northern route would have overcome the chief obstacles of the march as soon as it reached Kabul, one advancing along the southern route by Kandahar would be beginning to encounter the greatest difficulties of its task at that place, as it would have to cross the mountains which would oppose it there. Apart from the obstacles which these mountains present to the advance of such a column by their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wild and precipitous character, the English fortifications of the passes traversing them and the very strong, fortified British possession of Quetta would have to be seriously reckoned with. It might, therefore, be more advantageous for the southern Russian column, which would be separated here from the northern one by a distance of about 400 miles, to leave thirty thousand men in a well-entrenched position at Kandahar to provide against an English advance from Quetta, and proceed by the road at the western foot of the west Suleiman mountains to Saiadabad on the route to the Schutar Gardan pass and the Kurram valley, and there operate in connection with the northern column. The particular operations to be undertaken by the Russians would depend upon the strength of their attacking columns in siege guns of mean calibre available for a probably successful attack on the strongest pass fortifications and on those of Quetta, and upon what they might be able to learn as to the distribution of the British forces on the western frontier of India.

There is a further possibility, namely, that the northern Russian column, instead of attacking the fortified Khyber pass and the military station of Peshawur, should merely send against them one strong detachment for observation, and then should march along the road on the west slope of the west Suleiman mountains and advance by the Schutar Gardan pass, while the southern column proceeded either through the Ghuleri pass or the Tochi Valley against the middle Indus. In this case, however, both armies would operate at such a distance from each other as would preclude all prompt mutual support, so that it would seem to be more advisable for the northern Russian column to push on to Peshawur and the Punjab Northern State Railway and shut in Peshawur from the north. The skill of the Russian military leadership would show itself at this point by keeping the adversary in the dark about the line of advance of the main force.

Should the Russian forces succeed in such a design upon Peshawur, the Anglo-Indian forces would still be left in possession of the strong barrier of the Indus, which is easily to be defended, especially in late autumn and at high water.

The main difficulties of the Russian advance consist in the immense distances to be traversed and the mass of war material of all kind, especially of provisions, ammunition, and beasts of burden, which an advancing army, operating so far from all pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tective military establishments and depots, would be compelled to take with it. Further, the accommodation for troops is extremely limited in that region, being confined to isolated tracts of land; while the problem is aggravated by the difficulties of marching occasioned by the lack of high roads in mountains where the passes are higher than those of the Alps, not to speak of the molestations to be apprehended from the wild people inhabiting them. Moreover, the highland character of the land would restrict operations exclusively to the summer, so that the actual attack on India would probably have to take place in the autumn. However, Asiatic armies with far less resources at their disposal have traversed these routes in ancient and modern times, and the hardiness of the Russian soldier would be scarcely likely to succumb to the demands made upon him by such a campaign.

We have now to consider the number of troops which would be available to Russia for such an attack upon India, and the time which would be required for the Russian advance.

Bokhara and Turkestan number about 41,000 men on a peace footing. In view of the great importance of Herat as a base of operations for a Russian attack on India, it is not impossible—though it can scarcely be said to be probable—that England might undertake a defence, if not of Herat itself, of other parts of Afghanistan against a Russian attack; and in such an event the Russians would be incited to an effort to secure Herat with as little delay as possible. For this attack, the Russian troops in Trans-Caspia, whose most advanced posts at the Zulficar pass and at Sahri Yari are only about 230 miles (say twenty marches) from Herat, might be immediately employed against that place, while the troops located in the northeast of Trans-Caspia might be brought up by rail. In such a situation, the attitude of the Afghans would, of course, be of special importance. It is true that their Amir is subsidized by England, but his control over the wild Afghan tribes is slight, and it is not impossible that the latter, in their desire for booty, would rather follow a Russian summons to join in an expedition against wealthy India, than an English invitation to defend Herat, without immediate chance of profit. In any case, Russia, by reason of her greater nearness to Herat, is at considerable advantage. The next important body of Russian troops available for the expedition to India—that in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trans-Caucasia and Cis-Caucasia—amounts to about 104,000 men, exclusive of the troops guarding the frontier, of the militia and the garrisoned artillery; its war footing being about 275,000. The troops garrisoned in Tiflis, Kutais, Poti, Elizabethpol, Batum, and in the neighborhood of the South Caucasian Railway, being completely mobilized, could reach the harbor of Krasnovodsk in about four or five days, including embarkation and disembarkation. These would form the first echelon of the main body of the army of operation, following the vanguard formed by the trans-Caspian, Bokharan, and Turkestan troops near Dushak, Old Sarakhs and Merv. From Krasnovodsk they could reach Dushak by rail in two or three days.

Once the railway projected *via* the Caucasus is completed, the troops from Cis-Caucasia would be able to follow those from Trans-Caucasia at short intervals. The advance of the first Caucasian troops to Herat from Dushak might begin in about six days after their departure from Baku, and they would be able to arrive at Herat in about four weeks thereafter. It would depend on the efficiency of the Trans-Caspian Railway how rapidly the numbers of the Russian forces about Herat would increase. If both roads from Dushak and Merv to Herat were promptly used, over 150,000 men of the Trans-Caspian and Caucasian armies could be assembled at Herat within two months.

Of the Russian forces in Central Asia, only those garrisoned in Trans-Caspia, Bokhara, and Turkestan (that is, in the military district of Turkestan) would be serviceable for such a war. These are nearly all garrisoned on the Trans-Caspian Railway from Kizil Arvat to Samarkand, or, as at Tashkend, Khokand, and its environs, at a practicable distance from the terminus at Samarkand. The Russian forces in the Siberian governments by reason of their great distance and the necessity of protecting these territories, could not be employed in the operations under consideration. The difficulty which the Russian administration has to face with respect to the number of troops to be employed in an expedition against India, consists essentially in determining how far the increased efficiency which numerically strong forces display upon the scene of war may possibly be offset by the immense difficulty of providing commissariat required for them, as well as ammunition, transport, and other war material.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the same time there must be taken into account the strength of the Anglo-Indian army and of its newly reorganized troops, the probable loss of the Russians in sick and wounded (a loss extremely difficult to replace), and the possibility of securing the lines of operation. Many apparently well-informed specialists reckon the British force available for a movement on Herat at 70,000 men, and that available for defending the Indus (if England confined herself thereto) at 100,000. The remaining 126,000 out of 226,000 men (according to others 239,000) composing the Anglo-Indian army, they regard as necessary for insuring England's political supremacy and control in India, and therefore not available for employment on the battlefield. We are of opinion, however, that if sufficient stores of arms and ammunition were created to render possible the speedy drilling of men, England would understand how to enroll under her banner a considerably larger number from the most war-like Indian races, with a view to meet the Russian invading army on the Indus in sufficient force to bring about a decisive action. With a Hinterland, therefore, with 290,000,000 inhabitants, from whom two-thirds of her Anglo-Indian army are already drawn, it may be presumed that England would appear at the Indus with more than 100,000 combatants. In that case, of course, Russia must appear with more than 150,000 men, considering her extraordinarily long line of connection, upon which she must leave about 50,000 men. But Russia can take her time in preparing for a campaign in which it would be a serious and unpardonable blunder if she did not turn to account her numerical superiority to England in thoroughly drilled troops. By continual reinforcements of troops and weapons from the mother country, and by using the supplies of men available in India, England might draw up such numerous new formations there that she might succeed, if it were only by carrying on irregular warfare, in doing considerable damage to an insufficiently strong Russian army, and even eventually in bringing about its overthrow.

We have seen that, within two months after mobilization, about one hundred and fifty thousand Russian troops might be assembled at Herat, and that they might reach Kabul within three to three and a half months thereafter. The Anglo-Indian army administration would, therefore, have about five to five and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a half months in which to organize new forces on the Indus. In that period England might, by an extraordinary effort, bring together for the defence perhaps seventy thousand men of her native troops—say two army corps—together with her reserves from the mother country. At the same time she could employ her navy to attack Russia by sea, leaving to the remainder of her land forces of the line, reinforced by her militia and volunteers, the protection of Great Britain. The transport from Portsmouth to Kurrachee takes about four weeks, including embarkation and disembarkation, so that a fleet carrying thirty-five thousand men of all arms might accomplish the voyage to India and back two times during the five months required for the movement of the Russian troops to Kabul.

Let us now examine more closely the political and strategical situation of the English in British India. The possession of India has been for a century, and still is to-day, the source of immense advantage to Great Britain. England's capital is actively employed in India; her industry finds there one of its most important markets, and her gentry secure there numerous official positions and good incomes. Above all, the possession of India gives to England a prestige which is of incalculable value for her trade in the whole of Asia. It is to be assumed, therefore, that Great Britain would protect her relations to India at any expenditure of her rich resources.

The Anglo-Indian Empire presents, further, a very vivid contrast to the Asiatic territories of Russia. Here wide and often vast spaces and steppes, thinly populated by nomad tribes; there an extremely rich, and for the most part fertile and highly cultivated land, with the immeasurable resources arising out of the labor of 290 million inhabitants. The two hundred thousand English who dominate the vast population of India have not become fused with the natives in any respect, but even at the present moment stand in sharp opposition to them, as their rulers; whereas the Asiatic races subjugated by Russia have rapidly become assimilated with their conquerors. Therein lies the weakness of England's position as opposed to Russia, and that is aggravated by the circumstance that the people of India are convinced of Russia's superiority to England, especially since the last two Anglo-Afghan wars, which ended with the evacuation of Afghanistan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As we have seen, Great Britain can defend India either by a move upon Herat or by holding Peshawur, the Khyber pass and Quetta, and occupying the passes of the east Suleiman mountains (which form her frontier toward Waziristan and Afghanistan), and attacking the Russian forces on their debouching from these passes; or she might occupy the line of the Indus, which forms an uncommonly strong obstacle to operations, especially in late autumn, when the Russian attack might be expected. She might even, were occasion favorable, advance from the strong, fortified flank position of Quetta against Kandahar, and take the offensive against a southern or northern Russian column. One reason why the British should undertake the offensive action against Herat or Kandahar would be the favorable impression which such an operation would make upon the races of India, as well as the possibility of securing Afghanistan, which, it must be confessed, however, would be likely to be a thoroughly unreliable ally.

The disadvantages of this operation, however, would be very numerous. Russia could unquestionably reach Herat before England and would confront the British there with greater numerical and physical strength, not yet weakened, as the British would be, by a long march, such as that from Pashawur or Quetta to Herat. It would, moreover, carry the Anglo-Indian troops through countries where there are mostly "only men and stones," the climate of which could not easily be sustained by most of the native troops of the Anglo-Indian army. It would further require a long line of communication through very difficult country, which would have to be protected by many thousands of troops, and could not be completely secured against unforeseen attacks of hostile tribes or Russian irregular troops. In case of a British defeat it would force the Anglo-Indian troops to a very difficult retreat through long defiles, where they could hardly escape disaster, and it would carry the British defence of India into regions where the supports of the northwestern Indian frontier (namely Quetta, the Suleiman mountains, so difficult to pass, and the strategical barrier of the Indus) would not be available.

On the other hand, should the Anglo-Indian army await the Russian attack on the Indus, it could meet the attack there with far greater numerical strength, in immediate connection with its magazines and with its stores of armor and ammunition and with its relief troops, and connected by railway with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rich resources of the Hinterland, besides being near the line of sure communication with the mother country. Should England be threatened in a war of this kind by the Franco-Russian alliance, she would, of course, be able to move fewer troops of her standing army from Great Britain to India. But, as the landing of a French army on the British coast could doubtless be prevented at any time by the British fleet and the coast defences, a considerable portion of the British army might, in any case, be sent to India under the protection of the British fleet.

It would, in our opinion, be a cardinal mistake on the part of Russia, or of any other nation, to underrate England's capacity to meet the demands which would be made upon her fighting strength when her position as the leading power in Asia is at stake. At the same time, if Russia made commensurate efforts she might still be able, in the long run, in consequence of the vast masses of men she possesses trained for war, to appear on the Indus with numerically superior forces, and she would further enjoy the indisputable advantage of having leaders better trained for war on a large scale, and troops better drilled through great manœuvres and perhaps capable of greater endurance.

The military position of England in India, where some 74,000 English troops maintain Great Britain's supremacy over 290,000,000 inhabitants, is in itself by no means a strong one. On the outbreak of a war a general insurrection against the foreign supremacy might arise, and the English army in India is numerically but weak. True, the native army is reliable, but, like the British-Indian troops, not sufficiently trained in the European fashion against such an adversary as the Russian army would be. Besides, it still possesses many defects of organization. The armies of the Independent States are no match for the Indo-British troops, but they might prove effectual in interrupting communications in the interior of the Indian Empire, and form the nucleus for such a general insurrection as has been alluded to.

Let us now examine the western frontier district of British India, the distribution of British troops there, and the railway system. The western frontier of India, from the mouth of the Indus to the Khyber pass, about 646 miles long, follows in general the eastern slope of the east Suleiman mountains. It is protected from immediate attack in its southern portion from the sea to the district of Quetta by the desert of Mekran, so that only the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

northern part, from Quetta to the Khyber pass, is to be considered. While the mountains lying between the fortified position of Quetta and Kandahar are very difficult to pass, in spite of the existence of the Bolan and other passes, the Suleiman chain and the mountains north of it are, on the other hand, crossed by numerous passes which may be traversed by troops with comparative ease. The northernmost of these is the Khyber pass with the high road from Kabul to Lahore, which has been made use of for the conquest of India by nearly all armies from the earliest times. The road leads, with many branches, through a series of passes, the most eastern of which, the actual Khyber pass, is blocked by the British fort of Jamrud, lying only about eleven and a quarter kilometres from the great military station of Peshawur. The next southern connection between the Kabul valley and the plain of the Indus is formed by the valley of the Kurram and the Schutar Gardan pass, and may likewise be crossed by large army divisions.

At the spot where the river Kurram emerges from the mountains lies the garrison of Eduardesabad, and some sixty miles north that of Kohat. From Ghazni, on the road from Kabul to Kandahar, two highways lead to India by the Tochi pass in the Gambela valley, and by the Sargo pass in the Gomal valley to the Ghuleri pass by the eastern Suleiman mountains. The strong garrison of Eduardesabad and Dera Ismail Khan guard the exits of both these passes. There follow to the south a number of passes which all have their outlet on the west toward Kandahar. Between British-India and Afghanistan proper there lies the neutral mountainous zone of Waziristan, about sixty to one hundred and sixty miles broad, which is inhabited by free and warlike tribes, such as the Afridis, the Orakzais, etc., which are subject to British and Afghan influence, and which English policy has endeavored till now to keep friendly by presents, and to keep them in control by military posts in small forts, but which are now in insurrection against the British supremacy. All the more important passes, with the exception of the Bolan pass, are under control of these tribes, their eastern exits being guarded by British posts or garrisons. These tribes would be welcome allies in an Indian war, and it is of considerable importance to England to subdue them again.

The left wing of the British line of defence consists of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great military station of Quetta, which is about 375 miles distant from the right wing, the military depot Peshawur, being protected by a girdle of five forts on the west side. Quetta possesses a garrison of two English infantry regiments, three native infantry regiments, one native cavalry regiment, one division of field artillery, and one division of garrison artillery, while the garrison of Peshawur is about one-third smaller. The defensive works of the position lie northwest on the border of the plain of Pishin, an advanced post on the Khojak pass. The fortified position of Quetta possesses such strength that it is considered by many British specialists to be impregnable, as the Russians would be unable to bring heavy artillery up to it. It is hard to say, however, why siege guns of mean calibre, such as follow the movements of field armies to-day, and which are capable of attacking any fortress, might not be employed against it.

The position of Quetta is connected by railway with Jacobabad and with the Indus line at Sukkur. The railway lines which might be used for assembling Anglo-Indian troops at the passes in question are, on the north, the Lahore-Peshawur line, which crosses the Indus by an iron bridge, and at this point is blocked by Fort Attock. From here a line branches off at Rawul Pindee to Kuschalgarh, which is connected with the road to Kohat and Thall.

From the Lahore-Peshawur line branches off further, at Lalla Musan, the Indus line to Multan, Dera Ismail Khan, and Kalabagh. With its railway line the garrison of Dera Ismail Khan and Dera Ghazi Khan are connected by pontoon bridges over the Indus at Kotla and Mahmud Kot. At Multan the south main line of the Indus railway begins, which leads north to Lahore, south to the port of Kurrachee, and crosses the Indus at Sukkur. Near Sukkur the Bolan railway branches off from it at Rulk.

From the structure of the railway net-work of the Indus, as well as from the distribution of the British troops, it may be seen that it is only at the Khyber and Bolan passes, at Peshawur and Quetta, that the concentration of strong British forces can be effected in a comparatively short time. Should the English, however, succeed in obtaining prompt information as to the strength and the direction of the Russian advance, they might be able to forward their troops promptly and encounter the Russians at the Suleiman mountains.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The eastern chains of these mountains form, as we have seen, the first line of defence of India, the second line being the broad stream of the Indus, which in late summer is a rushing torrent, nowhere fordable. This river, about five hundred miles long from Attock to Sukkur, is even in its upper course from the mouth of the Kabul 250 metres wide and ten to fifteen metres deep, at high water being twenty to twenty-five metres deep. Its width increases up to the mouth of the Punjab, where it is 600 metres, while its depth decreases to about four to five metres. From the mouth of the Punjab it is 2,000 meters wide. The Indus thus forms a first-class obstacle to operations, its defence being materially assisted by the Indus railway, which runs parallel to it. The crossing of the river in the face of an enemy would be an extremely difficult operation. But even if an attacking Russian force could effect the passage of the stream, it would be confronted on the north by the Punjab or Land of the Five Streams, a land difficult to traverse, and on the middle and southern Indus by the desert of Sind, a hundred and forty miles broad and about four hundred miles long, behind both of which important sections of British resistance might be organized anew. The conquest of British India thus appears to be a task which would be one of extreme difficulty for a Russian force, if it were only on account of the immense spaces to be traversed, and of the unfavorable geographical circumstances. At any rate, as Russia must create a new base of operations on the Indus, leaving behind troops for its protection, this gigantic undertaking could not be carried out, as some suppose, with a hundred thousand men. The occupation of intermediate points and of the lines of communication would alone absorb a very considerable part of such a force.

At what points of the Indus railway system, in addition to those which have been named, the British troops would have to be held in readiness for meeting a Russian attack would depend upon the intelligence received as to the movements of the enemy. In any case, England would have to occupy in strength Peshawur and the Khyber pass, as well as Quetta, and she would also have to protect the Suleiman passes against possible advance from Ghazni. A majority of British strategists, Sir Edward Hamley, Lord Chelmsford, and others, do not favor offensive action against an advancing Russian army in Afghanistan beyond the strong

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

barrier of the Suleiman mountains and the Indus, for instance at Kabul or Kandahar. They favor, rather, an attempt to hold the strong northwestern frontier of India, with Quetta as an extremely firm support at the left, the Suleiman Mountains in the middle, and a strong entrenched camp at Peshawur, opposite the east mouths of the Khyber pass. Lord Chelmsford, indeed, proposes another entrenched camp at Ghazni, on the entrance to the Ghuleri and the Tochi passes.

He rightly disapproves of holding the positions of Kandahar and Kabul, although the first is adapted to fortification, while the latter is tactically too feeble, and both could be held only by a series of military and police posts, a course which would probably excite the susceptibilities of the Afghans. My opinion is that if India is to be defended beyond the Indus on the line of Quetta, the Suleiman mountains, and Peshawur, the Indus River requires a greater number of permanent bridges than those at Attock and Sukkur, and that the pontoon bridges at Dera Ismail Khan and Dera Ghazi Khan, which perhaps at high water are not of use, must be replaced by iron bridges and provided with vast fortified *tête-de-ponts* to enable the Anglo-Indian forces defending the Suleiman passes to retire eventually in full security behind the Indus River, the second main line of India's defence. In the same way the existing bridges at Attock and Sukkur would require strong fortified *tête-de-ponts*, and a well-organized defence of the whole Indus line would require a junction if possible of Kalabagh and Attock by a direct railway line beyond the range of effective gun-fire from the right bank of the Indus.

Further calculations would be lost in the domain of pure conjecture, and it only remains to consider the question of providing on both sides for a fresh supply of troops. It is our opinion that it would take longer for Russia to land relief troops and war material on the field of operations than for the British. For Russia, as we have seen, the transport would consume from five to five and a half months, whereas the British could accomplish the transport in from four to five months, including embarkation and disembarkation. Only in one case would the celerity and regularity of the transport of British reinforcements be affected; that is in the event of the French fleet joining with the Russian-Baltic fleet to threaten England on the one hand with invasion or a Russian diversion, and thus confine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the British fleet to the Channel, or, on the other, succeed in attacking the Indian transport ships.

It is thus evident that the constantly and gradually approaching struggle of Russia in India depends on the co-operation of a number of factors, so that no one can forsee in what manner it will take place, nor can any conjecture be made as to the question whether Russia or England has the greater chance of success in such a struggle. If at the outset Russia could appear upon the field with troops stronger in number and better drilled for a great war than England could muster, it must not be forgotten that England, with her immense national wealth, has nearly always managed in moments of extreme danger to surprise her adversaries by measures improvised for the occasion, and to win success for her flag and for her policy.

ROGALLA VON BIEBERSTEIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEED OF POSTAL REFORM.

BY THE HON. E. F. LOUD, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS.

No measure of the same degree of public importance, particularly to the magazine and newspaper press of the country, has been so much misunderstood and so persistently misrepresented as the bill for post-office reform to which, as a matter of custom, my name has been attached. Were it not for such misapprehension, the committee of publishers who have charged themselves with the duty of defeating this measure would have found their task an exceedingly difficult one.

It is an acknowledged fact that the United States government is losing $40,000,000 annually on the matter which it carries through the mails at the second-class rate of one cent a pound. This imposing fact, which is closely related to the increasing annual deficit of our post-office establishment, is sure some time to call for positive consideration. The bill under discussion aims simply to restrict the privileges of second-class matter to such publications as were evidently intended by the framers of the original law. The measure itself contains nothing new and, above all, wages no war on the legitimate press. It has been endorsed by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, representing 80 per cent. of the daily circulation of the country, at its last two annual meetings; by the Illinois State Press Association; by the Agricultural Press League; by the American Trade Press Association; by the Chicago Trade Press Association; besides almost numberless commercial and trade organizations. The bill has been steadily before Congress in its present shape for more than two years, and on January 6, 1897, passed the House of Representatives by a decisive vote. Hearings were given before the committee of the Senate; but, as less than two months of the expiring Congress re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mained after the bill came to the upper chamber, it failed to reach a vote there. The absence from this country at the time of Senator Wolcott, Chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and one of the most earnest advocates of the bill, accounts in large part for this result. These observations are made merely to show that the measure is not a new one, as many of its opponents assert, and that no feature of it has failed to receive the fullest investigation. In this light it is sad to contemplate the alarm of the publishers' committee that the press of the country came so near being wiped out of existence without knowing that a measure for its destruction was contemplated!

The first substantial exclusion from the second-class rate, which the bill contemplates, is that of novels, upon which the government loses at a conservative estimate eleven cents a pound. It is safe to say that it was never intended to admit these to the pound rate. It was by construing the law and not following its obvious intent that such works of fiction, when issued in the form of serials, have been admitted. There is apparently no reason why so-called literature, good and bad, when served in this form, should be carried at a rate one-eighth that charged for mailing Bibles, dictionaries, school books, and other works of general literature. Twenty years ago nobody had any doubt as to what constituted newspapers and magazines within the meaning of the law, but some publishers have so enlarged the meaning of these terms that they can now hardly be recognized by their closest friends. And yet these publishers have become so intrenched in the positions they enjoy that they say we should not disturb "vested rights," that we should take no backward step, even to save the Treasury from bankruptcy. They imply that as a result of their emjoyment of this privilege good literature has been made so cheap that the poor farmer's boy at the edge of the backwoods now has his library. But they neglect to point to the tremendous fall in the price of paper, the invention of the type-setting machine, and other economies in the art of printing, which are the real means of bringing literature within the reach of those who formerly could not possess it. A late member of the publishers' committee opposing this bill has stated in a recent magazine article that the serial novel has fulfilled its mission of educating the masses and is now gradually ceasing to be a weighty factor in the mails. If that be true, no one should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seriously object to the first section of the bill, which will transfer these novels from the one cent to the eight cent a pound rate, and so accomplish at once, so far as the mails are concerned, what, according to this contention, is bound to come about in time even if nothing is done.

A second section of the bill would eliminate from the pound rate privileges sample copies, and levy a charge of one cent for four ounces upon unsold copies of newspapers and periodicals returned to agents or publishers. Heretofore no right of return at less than eight cents a pound has been granted to publishers, the news companies enjoying to themselves this privilege of returning at one cent a pound. The compromise is, therefore, a concession to the great body of publishers. The right to send out magazines and newspapers to regular subscribers at the one cent rate is, of course, undisturbed, as is also the weekly free distribution of country newspapers to subscribers within the county in which they are issued. But it is the striking out of the sample copy privilege that has excited against the pending bill the most serious opposition. This is a privilege which has been a most fruitful source of abuse. Journals supported wholly by advertisements are able to flood the country with millions of pounds of matter, which is in no sense the dissemination of either current literature or of news, other than such news as this class of advertising may convey. The philanthropic lobby opposing the bill ask us to prevent this abuse, but still to leave the privilege open to the legitimate publications. But human ingenuity is too sharp to make it safe to leave any loop holes. To frame a law which shall clearly define what constitutes a periodical is a difficult task; the line of demarcation between different grades of publications is so faint as to make such restrictions impracticable. There is, however, one vital underlying distinction which may be made a working basis of intended reforms. The legitimate publications exist by reason of a paid subscription list; the others by a subscription list only nominal, together with an enormous circulation of sample copies, running up in certain instances to hundreds of thousands. Since the circulation governs the advertising rates, some of these papers, which have practically no genuine paying subscription list, are able to command as high as $4,000 a page per issue for their space. It seems hardly right that the government should

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subsidize to so great an extent this method of advertising, when it leaves the owners of bill boards and stereopticon devices standing on their own business merits.

Students of the postal problem for many years have agreed that this was the kind of matter which should be excluded from the second-class privilege, before the postal deficit became so heavy as to break down with its own weight that important branch of the service. It was the unanimous opinion of the executive committee of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association that no measure more liberal in its scope than this would accomplish anything, although the writer of this article was at that time willing to concede a percentage of sample copies, based on actual subscriptions, and this is what the country press are now asking. But simple as this would seem, further investigation has shown that this privilege when once granted would open the sluice-ways. The publication which is now monthly would probably become a weekly, the weekly a daily, and in that way evasions would be discovered for multiplying by four or by six the sample copy percentage intended. Another plausible suggestion is that the sample copy privilege should be unlimited for country papers within the county of publication. But once grant even this privilege, and how easy it would be for the advertising sheet to be admitted and published in the country town, side by side with the legitimate local newspaper, and thus find its way into every household free. It has, therefore, on second thought been deemed best to strike at the root of the sample copy privilege, even though to a certain extent the innocent must thereby suffer with the guilty. The advantage to the legitimate publishers of cutting out these free sample-copy periodicals would be so great as to compensate them for the extra cost of mailing their own samples.

A third section of the bill substantially repeats the existing law, except that publications of incorporated colleges, State Medical Boards and State Agricultural Societies are not allowed to mail their publications at pound rate to others than to legitimate subscribers, The incorporated college is in most instances a commercial concern doing business for profit, and the periodical which it issues is for the purpose of attracting patronage to it. This is clearly a legitimate and an honorable business; but why should the United States government subsidize it by con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinuing to carry such publications at a loss of eleven cents per pound. The fact that schools are supported at public expense does not apply as an argument, for it is only where the supervision and management are in the hands of the tax-paying public that such an expense is entailed.

Another section of the bill contains a proviso that extra numbers of any periodical sent out by the publisher to addresses furnished by an advertiser shall pay postage at the rate of one cent for four ounces. To this proposal there is little objection, as in such cases the publisher merely acts as the distributing agent for the advertiser. It is further ordered that it shall not be permissible to mail any article or any part of a periodical separated from the rest of the publication, except at the third-class rate. This proviso is necessary to prevent the circulation of serial novels at the pound rate as supplements, or prizes, in connection with a newspaper. Second-class rates are still to be allowed to fraternal societies and trades unions, whose publications are paid for from a general fund rather than by direct personal subscription.

Perhaps the words, "and must have a legitimate list of subscribers who voluntarily order and pay for the same," have excited the most opposition and the bitterest comment upon the pending bill. But even this is not new legislation. The language is taken from the present regulation defining a subscriber, and yet the so-called publishers' committee are shedding tears of anguish over the fate of the poor country editor who will be required to get his pay in advance from his subscribers or place a one-cent stamp on each copy. No doubt, the interpretation by interested parties of other statutes which have been many years in existence and have proved innocent in their operation would be startling! Many penal statutes would doubtless appear unduly harsh if the offender suffering under them were allowed to define their meaning and intent. Under the law, to subscribe must be a voluntary act, and a subscriber one who accedes to certain conditions. In the case of a periodical, a subscriber must be one who pays for the same, not necessarily in advance but at a time within reason, according to the rules that govern ordinary business transactions. Nothing is to be feared from this proviso that does not apply to the letter, the interpretation, and administration of the present law, and the misrepresentation it has occasioned can have no other purpose than to deceive. This is a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conspicuous feature of the circulars with which the country is now being flooded from the lobby maintained to defeat this measure.

The people who send first-class matter—ordinary letters and postal cards—and who make up the postal deficit, are entitled to some privileges. They pay annually about seventy million dollars upon as many pounds of matter, as against the three million dollars which 365,000,000 pounds of second-class matter yield, or a dollar a pound for one as against a cent for the other. Unless the second-class privilege is restricted to its legitimate uses the time will come when the tax-paying public will go beyond the point of reason and equity in correcting this disparity, and all publishers will suffer the penalty of wrongs too long unredressed. In 1890 this country agreed, with others assembled in Postal Union, to give such delivery of mail matter here as the other countries had given to their people. England, France, Germany, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and Switzerland have at least one free delivery of mail per day. Eight years have passed, and yet only last year did this country make a substantial beginning on rural free delivery. While we doubtless have a right thus to break faith with the foreign countries involved in such a trade as this, we have no right in equity to deny such delivery to our own people when they pay so roundly on first-class matter. But free delivery cannot be made general so long as second-class matter continues this great drain upon the Treasury.

Another section of the bill enacts a regulation of the Post Office Department, by which it may require partial separation of periodicals before mailing for convenience of handling. Many large publishers already do this to expedite delivery. The section is permissible, not mandatory. This is one of the points held up by the lobby to the country publisher as a great hardship, and it must indeed be a telling argument with the man who has a circulation of 400 copies, most of which go to one town, and for which he pays the government nothing! It stands to reason that this regulation will be of use to the department only in dealing with the large publishers who have a considerable circulation along many postal routes.

A favorite form of opposition to these postal reforms is the argument that something else should be done instead. It is granted that the deficit should be reduced; but opponents of the bill say, why not make the saving somewhere else? Why not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolish the franking privilege, which costs the government perhaps $10,000,000 a year? Why not reduce the compensation which the railroads receive? Along both these lines substantial reforms might and should be made, and they have the hearty support of the writer; but it is no argument against one remedial measure to say that others should be attempted. Not everything can be done at once. Practical reform consists in attacking the enemy's works in detail, breaking the weakest and most vulnerable points first, and so proceeding to a desired completeness. While some restrictions could doubtless be made to advantage in the matter of franking, it should not be overlooked that if Congress made an appropriation for the mailing of public documents, etc., it would be simply changing money from one pocket to another. The general public seem to want these government publications and gratuities, and so they should pay in one form or another for their dissemination. There is also some tendency to confuse public with private interests, and to assume that, because the government is entitled to a certain privilege, private interests should be allowed the same.

It is doubtless true that the compensation now received by the railroads is excessive. When we consider that the railroads aided by land grants, which under the law receive but 80 per cent. of the regular compensation, are at that rate active and zealous competitors for the postal business, it is apparent that a general revision is advisable. Some newspapers assume to solve this whole question with one stroke of the pen by saying: "Railroads are paid eight cents a pound for carrying the mail; they should be cut down to one cent, the rate for which they now carry freight. This would stop the deficiency, and so solve the problem." This solution, plausible as it is, does not possess even the advantage of correct premises. Eight cents per pound, it is true, is the price which it costs the government to "transport" all its mail, but unfortunately for the calculations of these wise men there are many other items in the cost of transportation besides the railroad. Such misstatements, however, are probably not due to ignorance, since it is now exceedingly popular to put upon the shoulders of the railroads the ills we bear. As a matter of fact the railroad companies are paid about five cents a pound. It should not be overlooked in these discussions that the government has no power to compel railroads, except

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those aided by land grants, to carry the mails at any figure which they will not deem profitable. This perhaps might be a serious objection to reducing the mail rates to the level of those paid on freight without consulting the interested parties. The railroad companies are obliged to deliver mail to post offices within a distance of one-quarter of a mile of the station, which is a large item when we consider the thousands of post offices for which such service is performed. The government pays annually one million dollars for a similar service beyond the eighty-rod limit, and it is the obvious policy of the department to place offices within rather than beyond this boundary. Railroads also furnish expensive office room in the larger cities for the separation of mails, and the fact that mail is carried in odd and small lots over thousands of miles of road and under varying conditions makes it impossible to compare its proper cost with that of ordinary freight. The mails are carried on the fastest and most expensive trains, and in parcels as small as ten pounds. Freight is carried in carload lots of fifteen to twenty tons, while a postal car rarely carries more than four tons, and over the roads that carry the mails in such quantities the maximum rate is $17.10 a ton for 730 miles on "land grant" and $21.37 on other roads. But even if the railroads gave absolutely free transportation, a loss, by most conservative estimates, of $17,000,000 annually from handling second-class mail would result.

The great underlying principle beneath our proposition is justice. Patrons of the post office should be treated equally under the law, and the beneficiaries of the tax-payers' bounties should be those interests which it is acknowledged public policy to promote. While the newspapers and magazines as educators and moulders of public sentiment are doubtless entitled to certain privileges, this theory does not involve as a logical consequence that the government should carry rubber boots through the mails at a great loss, even though an old almanac joke were pasted on the left heel. One reform at a time, and the postal business will eventually be conducted on a business basis. The current annual deficit and the outrageous inequalities of the present system, which necessitate a denial of rural free delivery and render a reduction of postage impossible, are making themselves heard as arguments for reform.

E. F. Loud.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERVENTION OF THE UNITED STATES IN CUBA.

BY JOHN H. LATANÉ, PH.D.

THE Cuban question had its origin in the same set of circumstances which led to the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, and it has frequently called for the application of that cardinal principle of American diplomacy. For more than three-quarters of a century this subject has periodically agitated public opinion in the United States, and to some extent in Europe; it has filled pages and volumes of our diplomatic correspondence; it has been incorporated in one form or another in the platforms of our principal political parties, and upon it we have the recorded utterances of the great body of American statesmen, beginning with Jefferson and Madison. With such a long chain of precedents, it is not strange that our Cuban policy since the outbreak of the present insurrection has presented no new features. No solution of the question has been suggested that does not find a parallel, if not an exact prototype, in some earlier phase of its history.

Until 1845 our policy consisted in the application of the Monroe doctrine to Cuba. During this early period our efforts were directed toward preventing the acquisition of the island or the establishment of a protectorate over it by Great Britain or France. In 1825 Mr. Clay declared to France "that we could not consent to the occupation of those islands (Cuba and Porto Rico) by any other European power than Spain under any contingency whatever," and in 1840, when British aggression was feared, the assurance was given to Spain by Mr. Forsyth, and repeated upon different occasions in 1843 by Mr. Webster and Mr. Upshur, that, in the event of an attempt on the part of any European power to wrest Cuba from her, Spain might "securely rely upon the whole naval and military resources of the United States to aid her in preserving or recovering it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With the Mexican War, however, and the consciousness of national expansion and "manifest destiny," our foreign policy assumed a much bolder and more aggressive character, and during the next fifteen years all manner of schemes for the southward extension of our territory were suggested and many of them actually undertaken. Cuba became an object of desire, not only in the eyes of the slave-holding population of the South as an acquisition to slave territory, but of a large part of the nation, by reason of its strategic importance commanding the interoceanic transit routes of Central America, which formed the most available line of communication with the rapidly-developing interests in California. Consequently various attempts were made to annex the island to the United States, both by purchase and forcibly by filibustering expeditions. These motives for annexation were removed, the one by the abolition of slavery in the United States, and the other by the construction of the great overland railroad systems.

Since the Civil War, therefore, our policy has been largely concerned in urging upon Spain the abolition of slavery in Cuba, the establishment of a more liberal form of government through independence or autonomy, and the promotion of more untrammelled commercial intercourse with the United States.

The Spanish revolution of September, 1868, was the signal for an uprising of the native or Creole party in the eastern part of the island of Cuba. This movement was not at first ostensibly for independence, but for the revolution in Spain. Its real character was, however, apparent from the first and its supporters continued for a period of ten years, without regard to the numerous vicissitudes through which the Spanish government passed, to wage a dogged though desultory warfare against the constituted authorities of the island. This struggle was almost coterminous with President Grant's administration of eight years. At an early stop of the contest the Spanish authorities conceived it to be necessary to issue certain decrees contrary to public law and, in so far as they affected citizens of the United States, in violation of treaty obligations. Secretary Hamilton Fish protested to the Spanish Minister against these decrees, and called attention to one in particular, which related to the search of vessels on the high seas, declaring that it assumed powers over the commerce of the United States that could be permitted only in time of war;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that if Spain was at war she should give notice to the United States to that effect, and that a continuance of the decree or any attempt to enforce it would be regarded by the United States as a recognition by Spain of a state of war in Cuba. This declaration produced a prompt modification of the decree in question, but others affecting the treaty rights of American citizens in Cuba continued in force.

As our commercial interests at large, as well as the interests of individual citizens, were deeply affected by the condition of the island, President Grant determined at the beginning of his administration to offer to mediate between Spain and the insurgents. General Daniel E. Sickles was selected for the Spanish mission, and in his instructions, dated June 29, 1869, he was directed to offer to the cabinet at Madrid the good offices of the United States for the purpose of bringing to a close the *civil war* then ravaging the island of Cuba. Mr. Fish instructed General Sickles to explain to the Spanish government that he used the term *civil war* advisedly, as implying not any public recognition of belligerent rights, but a condition of affairs that might not justify withholding much longer those rights from the insurgents. The terms upon which the United States proposed to mediate were the following:

1. The independence of Cuba to be acknowledged by Spain.
2. Cuba to pay to Spain a sum, the amount and conditions to be agreed upon.
3. Abolition of slavery in the island of Cuba.
4. An armistice pending the negotiations for the settlement above referred to.*

General Sickles was told that the United States would, subject to the approval of Congress, guarantee the payment of the sum to be paid by Cuba, but that he was to avoid such a complication unless it was made a *sine qua non* by the Spanish cabinet.

After several interviews had taken place, on August 13, General Sickles was authorized to state to his government that its good offices had been accepted, but on a somewhat different basis from that proposed by Mr. Fish. The Spanish government insisted that it was beneath the dignity of the mother country to treat with the insurgents while they were in arms, and that whatever agreement was arrived at must be in the nature of a volun-

* H. Ex. Doc. No. 160, p. 15, 41st Congress, 2d Session.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tary concession on the part of Spain, consummated according to strict legal or constitutional forms, and not in the nature of a treaty between armed powers. The Spanish propositions were, therefore, as follows:

1. The insurgents to lay down their arms.
2. Spain to grant simultaneously a full and complete amnesty.
3. The people of Cuba to vote by universal suffrage upon the question of their independence.
4. The majority having declared for independence, Spain to grant it, the Cortes consenting, Cuba paying a satisfactory equivalent guaranteed by the United States.*

These proposals were at once communicated by cable to the department at Washington. Secretary Fish replied on the 16th directing General Sickles to urge the acceptance of good offices on the basis proposed by the United States; that the first proposition of Spain, that the insurgents should lay down arms, was incapable of attainment; that the third, to ascertain the will of the Cubans by vote, was impracticable because of the disorganization of society and the terrorism that prevailed as a result of the violence and insubordination of the volunteers. In subsequent telegrams Mr. Fish repeated his directions to General Sickles to negotiate only on the basis proposed by the United States.

While matters were in this state two unfortunate incidents occurred which so excited public opinion in Spain and in the United States as to completely thwart all efforts at negotiation. One was the detention by the United States of some gunboats built for the Spanish government for use against Cuba, but which the Peruvian minister claimed would be used against Peru, or would take the place of other boats which would then be used against his country. The other incident which excited general indignation in the United States was the illegal execution of two American citizens, Speakman and Wyeth, at Santiago de Cuba. Furthermore, the Spanish government allowed the purport of the American note to get out, and it was accepted by the press as indicating the purpose of the United States to extend recognition to the Cubans if its offer of mediation were refused. No Spanish cabinet could stand under the odium of having made a concession to the Cubans under a threat from an outside power.

The cabinet, therefore, requested the withdrawal of the American note. In accordance with instructions from Washing-

* H. Ex. Doc. No. 160, p. 22, 41st Congress, 2d Session.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ton, General Sickles withdrew on the 28th of September the offer of the good offices of the United States. In acknowledging this communication the Spanish minister of State made the statement that the note was withdrawn. General Sickles at once had this statement corrected, as the note contained, in addition to the offer of good offices, an exposition of the motives of the President in making the offer, and a statement of the general considerations deemed by him essential to a settlement of the Cuban question. It was also the record of an important transaction, which the United States had no intention of destroying. The administration wished to have a record of their offer of mediation as a basis for future negotiation, if occasion should require.

Throughout these negotiations the Spanish cabinet insisted that emancipation of slaves and the promulgation of extensive political and commercial reforms in the island were parts of the programme of the liberal party, through whom the revolution of 1868 had been effected, and that these reforms, in accordance with the spirit of the constitution of 1869, would already have been extended to the island but for the unfortunate insurrection. As regards the slavery question, the cabinet of Madrid found itself unable to choose between the horns of the dilemma. The United States and Great Britain were both urging the immediate abolition of slavery, while the most influential upholders of Spanish rule in Porto Rico as well as in Cuba were the slave-holders themselves. In June, 1870, a special bill for the emancipation of certain classes of slaves in the colonies became law. This bill, known as the Moret law, from the name of the Minister of Colonies, provided for gradual emancipation, but instead of being a *bona fide* measure, it simply relieved the slave owner of the burden of supporting infants and aged slaves, and prolonged the institution as to the able-bodied. This law was enacted for public effect. As far as Cuba was concerned, it not only was not put into operation, but through the all-powerful influence of the Peninsular party it was not even allowed to be published in the island for nearly two years after the outside world thought it was in effect. Meanwhile, although the insurgents had abolished slavery by decree of February 26, 1869, the Captain-General, following the example of Abraham Lincoln, freed by proclamation, as a war measure, May 14, 1870, the slaves belonging to the insurgents.*

* Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 113, 41st Congress, 2d Session.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By the terms of an agreement concluded with the Spanish government by General Sickles, February 12, 1871, a mixed commission was organized at Washington to decide all claims presented by the United States for injuries done to citizens of the United States by the Spanish authorities in Cuba since October 1, 1868. The conclusion of this agreement took away all of the pressing grievances of the United States against Spain and for more than two years the relations of the two countries were on a comparatively friendly basis. General good feeling was further promoted by the proclamation of the Republic in 1873, and by the prompt action of General Sickles in extending to it the recognition of the United States at a time when all the powers of Europe, except Switzerland, withdrew from diplomatic relations with the new government. General Sickles urged upon the Republican government the abolition of slavery and the concession of self-government to Cuba.

But such happy relations did not long continue. On the 31st of October, 1873, the steamer "Virginius," sailing under American colors and carrying a United States registry, was captured on the high seas by the "Tornado," a Spanish war vessel, and on the afternoon of the 1st of November taken into the port of Santiago de Cuba. General Burrill, the commandant of the city, summoned a court-martial, and, in spite of the protests of the American Consul, condemned to death at the first sitting four of the passengers. They were shot on the morning of the 4th. On the 7th twelve more passengers were executed, and on the 8th Captain Fry and his entire crew, numbering thirty-six, making the total number of executions fifty-three. This incident raised many serious and intricate questions of international law, which were the subject of dispute between the two governments for fully two years. At an early stage of the negotiations for the settlement of the "Virginius" affair, General Sickles resigned his mission, as the result of a misunderstanding with Secretary Fish, and was succeeded by Mr. Caleb Cushing.

In his general instructions to Mr. Cushing before his departure for his post Mr. Fish expressed the policy of the administration at considerable length. Among other things he said: "The President cannot but regard *independence* and emancipation, of course, as the only certain, and even the necessary solution of the question of Cuba. And, in his mind, all incidental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions are quite subordinate to those, the larger objects of the United States in this respect." Nearly two years after this passage had been written the Grant administration determined, in view of the unchanged condition of the struggle, to bring matters to an issue, and to force, if need be, the hand of the Spanish government. On the 5th of November, 1875, Mr. Fish addressed a long letter to Mr. Cushing, in which, after reviewing the course of the insurrection, which had then extended over seven years, the interests of the United States affected thereby, the numerous claims arising therefrom (many of them still unsettled), the persistent refusal of Spain to redress these grievances, and her general neglect of treaty obligations, he concludes:

"In the absence of any prospect of a termination of the war, or of any change in the manner in which it has been conducted on either side, the President feels that the time is at hand when it may be the duty of other governments to intervene, solely with a view of bringing to an end a disastrous and destructive conflict and of restoring peace in the island of Cuba. No government is more deeply interested in the order and peaceful administration of this island than is that of the United States, and none has suffered as the United States from the condition which has obtained there during the past six or seven years. He will therefore feel it his duty at an early day to submit the subject in this light and accompanied by an expression of the views above presented for the consideration of Congress."

Mr. Cushing was instructed to read this note to the Spanish Minister of State. At the same time a copy was sent to General Schenck, United States Minister at London, with instructions to read the same to Lord Derby, and to suggest to him that it would be agreeable to the United States if the British government would support by its influence the position assumed by the Washington cabinet. In the course of a few days copies of this note were sent to our representatives at Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Rome, Lisbon, and St. Petersburg, with instructions to communicate its purport orally, or by reading the note, to the governments to which they were accredited, and to ask their intervention with Spain in the interests of terminating the state of affairs existing in Cuba.

The success of this move on the part of the United States depended upon the attitude of Great Britain with reference to the position assumed by our government. If the British cabinet acquiesced in the position taken by the American government, and promised its influence in support of that position, the mere expression of its approval of intervention would force Spain to whatever terms the two governments might jointly dictate, or to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a settlement of the question by the concession of liberal reforms without waiting for any action on the part of those governments. On the other hand, the refusal of Great Britain to co-operate with the United States would strengthen Spain in the policy she was pursuing. Mr. Fish, therefore, instructed Mr. Cushing to delay the presentation of the note of November 5th until General Schenck could communicate it to the British government, and find out whether Lord Derby would support his position. In other words, the tone in which Mr. Cushing would communicate the American note to the Spanish cabinet would depend entirely upon the attitude of Lord Derby.

An unforeseen event occurred, however, which materially interfered with Mr. Fish's plans. On the 16th of November, before the arrival of the American note of the 5th, Mr. Cushing received a note from the Spanish Minister of State in answer to his repeated demands, which was eminently friendly in spirit and conceded in substance or effect almost everything demanded by the United States in the way of special grievances. The substance of this note was at once communicated by cable to the department at Washington. This information placed the administration in a rather awkward position. If Spain had really promised to concede all the specific demands of the United States, the American note would fall rather flat upon the ears of the European cabinets. Still Congress was about to meet, the country was well weary of the condition in Cuba, and was expecting some definite recommendation from the Executive. The administration was in deep perplexity. On the 19th Mr. Fish cabled to General Schenck to delay reading the note to Lord Derby. This, of course, put a check upon Mr. Cushing at Madrid, as he had been instructed to await the outcome of events in London.

The receipt of the American note threw Mr. Cushing into a state of intense excitement. On the 25th he telegraphed his opinion to Mr. Fish:

"If Great Britain co-operates Spain will succumb, in sullen despair, to whatever terms the two governments may jointly dictate; but if Great Britain refuses to co-operate Spain will conclude that she has the sympathy of all European powers; more especially, as she thinks she has now gone, by her note of the 15th, to the ultimate point in satisfaction of each of the particular griefs of the United States. In other words, there will be war, and a popular, though desperate one on the part of Spain unless she can be convinced that the real and true object of the contemplated measure is to prevent war, as I understand it to be intended. But to ward off war will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exact the steady exercise of all my personal influence here (which my colleagues tell me is great), and will require that influence to be efficiently backed by my government both here and at Washington."

Next day he again sent a cable dispatch to Mr. Fish, asking:

"Will you authorize me, after the Spanish Minister is informed of the contents of the document, to talk to him as a friend and well-wisher regarding what, in my opinion, Spain ought to do and may honorably do in this emergency."

On the 27th Mr. Fish cabled him not to wait for a reply from Great Britain; that he might speak in the manner indicated in his telegram of the day before, provided that it did not do away with the object of the instruction; that the note was "not intended as criminatory in any sense but in the spirit of friendship, as a notice of a necessity which may be forced upon the President, but which he hopes to avoid, and desires Spain to aid him in escaping." He also indicated the general tone of the forthcoming message to Congress. In his message to Congress, December 7, 1875, President Grant discountenanced the recognition of either belligerency or independence, but intimated intervention as a necessity unless satisfactory results could soon be reached. It was this message which President McKinley quoted at such length in his recent message to Congress. This fact lends added interest to the episode under consideration.

The American note was presented to the Spanish and British governments on the same day, November 30th. Lord Derby informed General Schenck that her Majesty's government preferred not to discuss the note of November 5th until the President had had time to consider the Spanish proposals of the 15th.

Through Mr. Cushing's friendly representations, and in consideration of the friendly tone of the President's message, Mr. Calderon, the Spanish Minister, received the threat of intervention in good part, and expressed his intention of answering it after he should have had time to consider it carefully.

Mr. Fish decided not to back down from the position taken in his note of November 5th, notwithstanding the subsequent concessions of the Spanish cabinet, and he therefore instructed the representatives of the United States to continue to press upon the attention of the governments to which they were accredited the question of intervention.

The reply of Great Britain was given to General Schenck in an interview with Lord Derby, January 25, 1876. It was in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

substance that he was convinced that Spain would not listen to mediation, and that the British government was not prepared to bring pressure to bear upon her in case she refused; that the Spanish government hoped to finish the Carlist war in the spring, and would then be in a position to put forth its whole military strength for the reduction of Cuba; in conclusion, therefore, Lord Derby thought "that if nothing were contemplated beyond an amicable interposition, having peace for its object, the time was ill-chosen and the move premature." The answers of the other powers were unsatisfactory or evasive, none of them being willing to bring pressure to bear upon the government of young Alfonso while the Carlist war was on his hands.

The answer of Spain was finally given in the form of a note, dated February 3, 1876, addressed to the representatives of Spain in other countries, including the United States. This answer was written by Mr. Calderon in good temper. He stated that the insurrection was supported and carried on largely by negroes, mulattoes, Chinese, deserters, and adventurers; that they carried on a guerilla warfare; that Spain had sufficient forces to defeat them in the field; that the triumph of Spain would soon be followed by the total abolition of slavery and the introduction of administrative reforms. The number of troops and vessels of war in Cuba was enumerated to show that Spain was putting forth a reasonable effort to bring the rebellion to a close, and statistics were quoted to show that the trade between Cuba and the United States, as well as the general trade of the island, had actually increased largely since the outbreak of the insurrection. Finally he declared that, while individual foreigners had suffered, Spain had done justice to all claims presented.

Furthermore, in conversations with Mr. Cushing, Mr. Calderon repeatedly assured him that Spain was in full accord with the views of the United States in regard to the abolition of slavery, the extension of liberal political and administrative reforms to the island, and the promotion of unrestricted commerce, and was only waiting for the establishment of peace in order to put these measures of reform into operation. These promises and assurances of the Spanish government completely took the wind out of Mr. Fish's sails, and, together with Lord Derby's reply, put all further attempts at intervention out of the question.

The substance of Mr. Fish's note threatening intervention

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeared unofficially in the press of Europe and America in December, 1875, and attracted such general attention that in January the House asked for the correspondence. In reply Mr. Fish transmitted to Congress on the 21st the note of November 5th, together with a few carefully chosen extracts from the correspondence between himself and Mr. Cushing,* but nothing was given that might indicate that the United States had appealed to the powers of Europe to countenance intervention. As rumors to this effect had, however, appeared in the press, the House called the next day for whatever correspondence had taken place with foreign powers in regard to Cuba. Mr. Fish replied that the note of November 5th had been communicated to the foreign powers orally, but that no correspondence had taken place.† This was putting a very strict and a very unusual construction upon the term "correspondence," to say the least. The dispatches, notes, and telegrams that pass between a government and its representatives abroad are the only recognized means of communicating with foreign powers, and are always spoken of as the correspondence with those powers. The whole affair reveals a curious lack of frankness, or of courage on the part of Mr. Fish. He was trying to shield either the administration or himself, and did not wish the American public to know that he had reversed the time-honored policy of the State Department by appealing to the powers of Europe to intervene in what had always been treated, from the days of John Quincy Adams and Henry Clay, as a purely American question. At any rate the correspondence was suppressed for twenty years. On the 24th of March, 1896, the Senate called for all correspondence relating to mediation and intervention in the affairs of Cuba from November 5, 1875, until the pacification of the island in 1878, and on the 15th of April President Cleveland transmitted the "correspondence" called for, which forms a document of 137 pages.‡

The Cuban struggle continued for two years longer. In October, 1877, several of the leaders surrendered to the Spanish authorities and spontaneously undertook the task of bringing over the few remaining ones. Some of these men paid for their efforts with their lives, being taken and condemned by court-

* H. Ex. Doc., No. 90, 44th Congress, 1st Session.
† H. Ex. Doc., No. 100, 44th Congress, 1st Session.
‡ Sen. Ex Doc No. 213, 54th Congress, 1st Session.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

martial by order of the commander of the Cuban forces. Finally, in February, 1878, the terms of pacification were made known. They embraced representation in the Spanish Cortes, oblivion of the past as regarded political offences committed since the year 1868, and the freedom of the slaves of the insurgents. As regards representation in the Cortes, the Cuban deputies have never been representative men, but men of Spanish birth designated usually by the Captain-General. By gradual emancipation slavery ceased to exist in the island in 1885. The powers of the Captain-General, however, the most objectionable feature of Spanish rule, have continued uncurtailed.

The present insurrection has presented in the main the same features as the ten years' war; the same desultory methods of warfare; the same disregard by both parties of the rules of civilized nations, and the same liberal concessions on the part of Spain when intervention is spoken of. The Spanish government is lavish of promises but slow of fulfilment. If the government of the United States should ever consider it its high mission to intervene in the affairs of Cuba, whether in the cause of civilization, or of humanity, or of American interests, it must be armed intervention, and when once decided upon it must be carried to fulfilment, without regard to Spanish promises of reform.

JOHN H. LATANÉ.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE CIVIL WAR.—II.

BY SIR WILLIAM HOWARD RUSSELL, LL.D., SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT OF THE TIMES (LONDON).

NEXT morning, ere the Vigilants were awake, I was on board the steam ferry-boat crossing Cape Fear River to the railway station. The passengers were in violent excitement. I heard the belief expressed that "the British must help them." "But why so, may I ask, sir?" "Well, Colonel, it's just because Cotton is King, you see, and a hint about that will be quite enough for you Britishers."

The railway ran through pine forests and jungle, swamps, clearings, over great rivers and marshes, on trestle bridges or causeways. At Nichols Station there was a custom-house—we had entered the State of South Carolina. I do not recollect what was dutiable, but I was not asked to pay anything. Towards evening we were speeding towards a glint of water north of Charleston. Cavalry horses were picketed in the fields, tents were visible in the woods, and troops were marching as if at drill on the meadows. A block-like building shimmered through the haze, rising island-like from the sea. Smoke curled upwards from an angle of the wall. "There's Sumter!" cried the passengers. "Hurrah for the Stars and Bars! There it floats sure enough!" Charleston was in high revelry—triumph on every face, and an immense clinking of sabres and clatter of spurs and steel.

At Mills House I was met by Mr. Sam Ward, who had arrived from Washington, and before the night was over I was introduced to Governor Manning, Porcher, Miles, Senator Chestnut, Colonel Lucas, General Beauregard, and to other prominent citizens and soldiers—a set of very fine, tall, handsome fellows generally, with the air of gentlemen, and I may say of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exulting gentlemen, for "they had driven the Yankees out of their harbor—forever."

I found General Beauregard at his headquarters, writing at a table, surrounded by officers in the new Southern Confederacy uniforms, a squarely built, lithe, active man of middle height, broad-chested and solid, with a keen well-cut face, very intelligent, but not very determined; a soldierly air and a look which reminded me of that of an old French friend, Colonel Cler, of the Zouaves, who fell in the Crimea. Among his maps and plans were bouquets of roses and geraniums and other flowers sent in by his admirers, and vases filled with the same flanked his dispatch boxes. He received me with perfect courtesy. When some one of those present asked me what I thought of the bombardment of Sumter, and I replied that "I had not seen it," Beauregard waved his hand and said, "Mr. Russell, you know, has seen the bombardment of Sebastopol!"

Around me were all the paraphernalia of an officer commanding troops in the field, aides-de-camp, staff officers, orderlies. Maps and charts hung on the wall, copies of general orders; and sentries were on duty. I thought of the politicians, Senators, Congressmen, and all the coteries whom I had left at Washington, so full of schemes of conciliation and compromise, without, as far as I could see, the smallest semblance of a military force to oppose this flagrant and buoyant rebellion.

Beauregard talked at his ease without reserve. He had not much sympathy, I thought, with the cavalier pretensions of the South Carolinians, and cared but little for their aspirations, but he believed religiously in the righteousness of secession and in the wickedness of the abolitionists.

This United States officer, educated at West Point, distinguished by his gallantry in the war with Mexico, had left his civil employment as an engineer to batter down the fortress over which the flag of the United States was floating. He had become at once one of the foremost figures in the Confederate States. What he might have been, had he won the battle of Shiloh or stopped and overwhelmed Sherman on his march to the sea, who can say? But what he actually subsided into was the presidency of a railway and the managership of a State lottery.

Beauregard had a family history, the annals of which went back to the year 1290, and here it is. "When Tider the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Young, who had headed a revolt of the Welsh against Edward I., was defeated, he fled to France, where he married Miss Lafayette, Maid of Honour to the sister of Philip the Fair, and where he was finally appointed to a post in Saintonge and died there. His son, to propitiate the King, changed the name of Tider into Toutank; gradually the letter 'k' was dropped, 't' was put in its place and the family became Toutant, to which Beauregard was added. In the time of Louis XIV. an ancestor of the General came to Louisiana as commandant of a flotilla. There he settled and married. His grandson, in 1808, married Miss De Reggio, who was a descendant of the Dukes of Reggio and Mortlemain and of the House of Este. The General's great-grandfather was the Royal Standard-bearer and First Justiciary of the crown in Louisiana."

No wonder Beauregard looked down upon the mere sugar-cane growers and cotton planters around him with aristocratic hauteur.

Before I took leave of General Beauregard I was introduced to Major (afterwards General) Whiting, of his staff, who was to devote himself to me for the following day that I might see Fort Sumter. I dined with a number of the gentlemen, whom I have already mentioned, at the Mills hotel. Men of intelligence, well informed, polished, the equals of the same class in any European society, they gave way to ridiculous "rodomontade." It was astonishing to hear a man like Governor Manning declare that "the South never could be conquered." "We will welcome the world in arms with hospitable hands to bloody graves!"

One of the party declared that his visit to Europe had been spoiled by his anger at seeing white men acting as servants! Even well-educated men who read much, as Beauregard did, could not understand the sympathy in England for those who were against "the domestic institution" of slavery. The uprising in the North was treated with ridicule. Beauregard admitted he was surprised, and old men like Huger and Pettigrew shook their heads at it. "It's a washy sort of enthusiasm got up by lecturing and spouting," said Beauregard. "It will not stand fire!" I thought of his words afterwards when he was commanding at Bull Run, and fighting at Shiloh!

I was ill-advised enough by my argumentative spirit to ask, "Do you think the French are brave?" "Certainly; what of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that?" "Do you think you will defend yourselves against invasion better than the French could?" "We certainly would make invasion by the Yankees a pretty bad business for them."

"Suppose they come with an enormous preponderance of men and material, would you not be forced to submit?"

"Never! The Yankees are cowardly rascals; we have kicked them and cuffed them till we are tired of it. Besides, John Bull would step in; we know him very well. He will make a fuss at first, but Cotton is King and John will come off his perch at once when he finds he can't get cotton." For some time I was obstinate enough to challenge propositions of the kind, but I soon discovered that I was something like a raw Methodist missionary preaching to a crowd of Mohammedans in a bazaar in India, or a Protestant fanatic declaiming before a select Roman Catholic audience in Ireland against the abomination of Popery. I was out of touch with that world.

Presently I heard a bell tolling from some neighboring steeple, and one of the guests, in reply to my question, said: "It's for the colored people to go home! The guards will arrest any of them found on the streets without passes in half an hour." I could not help an interrogatory: "Is it possible?" When I was in Natal, nearly twenty years afterwards, and saw the Zulus in Durban and Pietermaritzburg repairing to their quarters under similar regulations, I understood the necessity of a "Black Curfew Bell."

As we were standing in the veranda looking out on a clamorous crowd of officers and privates of the Palmetto State Army, Mr. Pettigrew said to me in a low voice, "Do you know your Aristophanes well?" I had to confess that I had only a slight bowing acquaintance with "The Frogs." "But, no doubt," continued he, "you recollect the passage in one of his plays where he tells us how the women of Athens, having a monopoly of value, resolved that they would rule the world. They had the monopoly, but they did not succeed for all that. These people with their cotton monopoly will find themselves, I fear, in a similar case."

The situation was so interesting that I remained at Charleston for nine days in daily intercourse with men engaged, as they said, "in making history for themselves." They already saw the word "Finis" written in letters of gold. They were fighting for their liberty, and it was of no consequence to them that they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were fighting also for the perpetuation of slavery, "which has a most respectable history of its own—an antiquity lost in the haze which shrouds the life of primeval man from our researches, and a vitality that all the forces of Christianity cannot destroy." The idea of holding white men in bondage would have appeared monstrous to the South, but it was nevertheless some sort of comfort to the planting interest to know that it was universal when the world was young and that Republics and Monarchies alike in ancient days were founded upon helots and serfs.

I was in the midst of a great uprising which practically meant a fight for slavery—rather, perhaps, a rebellion against a government which was opposed to the extension of slavery, but which had not yet attacked the "domestic institution" itself. The abstract principle of States rights including the power of a State to vote itself out of the Union, I did not understand; but it was becoming clear to me that the North was resolved to upset it by the sword, and that the sword must decide it right or wrong. At heart I was an abolitionist, but I could not doubt the sincerity of the men who asserted that slavery was a thing to die for, and that no Union was worth having that did not hold that faith.

A familiar object in shop windows in England some twenty-five years ago—I am writing of 1861—was the effigy of a negro in chains with the pathetic legend, "Am I not a Man and a Brother?" The practical answer to the question in the minds, if not in the mouths, of many Southerners was, "No! you are not!" I was presented in Charleston with a handsome quarto by Messrs. Gliddon & Nott, entitled *Types of Mankind*, the *raison d'être* of which was an elaborate attempt to show that the negro had no right to say "*Homo Sum.*" On that rock the Confederacy was built. And strangely enough the slave States were all for free trade and against protection!

I visited Morris Island next day under the guidance of Major Whiting—a bright, indeed brilliant, young officer, a literary enthusiast—a ravenous reader—a worshipper of Thackeray; and far more inclined to talk to me of poets and novelists than of batteries and trenches.

The camps were filled with "Palmetto Eagles," "Davis Tigers," "Marion Guards," "Pickens Scorpions," etc. There was a sound of revelry in the tents, and wine crates, bottles and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cases of supplies outside—all to become unknown luxuries ere two years were out. When I asked whence all the guns and ammunition came from, one of the staff, with a wink and a smile, said, "They sprout up wonderfully. We had some good gardeners up North who produced a crop for us in case of need."

I escaped from the profuse hospitality of the camp and started off to Sumter, the bloodless bombardment of which was the prelude to one of the most sanguinary wars of modern times. There I made the acquaintance of Senator Louis T. Wigfall, of Texas. A very volcanic man, of the most daring courage—*impiger, iracundus*—in the thick of shot and shell at the height of the bombardment, when the fort was in flames, he put off in a skiff with a white handkerchief on his swordpoint, clambered up on the jetty, squeezed through an embrasure and dropped down before the astonished Federals with a demand for the surrender of the place! Would that I could propitiate his *manes* by a tardy but most sincere expression of regret that I caused him pain by ill-considered words!

Charleston volunteers were clearing away the rubbish and *débris* in the *terre plein* in a desultory fashion. "Why don't you employ your negroes at the work?" asked I, "instead of these gentlemen?" "Niggers are so stupid they would most likely blow themselves up, and then the State would have to pay the owners for them." "Then white men are not so valuable as niggers?" "Not always! That's a fact."

After a visit to the garrison we took our leave, but not until we had heard strongly worded complaints of the want of money. "Not a cent had officers or men got in the shape of pay."

As we were landing, guns were thundering from the forts and batteries to express the joy of Charleston at the formal Ordinance of Secession of the State of Virginia. I heard that evening, not for the first time, expressions in downright earnest, to all seeming, of a wish on the part of every guest for a union with England—anything rather than a reunion with New England. The wish cropped out of the deadly hate of the Yankee on the part of these fiery Carolinians. They had nothing in common with Sam Slick. "We are cavaliers; our names show our origin. Ashley, Cooper, Sumter, Pinckney, Charleston, and Carolina prove whence we came." Of Chestnut, Pickens, Rhett, Trenholm, Pringle, etc., they said nothing.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

My last night at Charleston was spent at the house of Mr. Pettigrew, where I met General Beauregard, Judge King, Mr. Huger, Mrs. King, Mrs. Carson and other delightful gentlemen and ladies. The Southern women, charming as they were, I found more inveterate against the Black Republicans than the men. Many of the latter, indeed, were driven, I think, by the feminine vituperation to join the Confederate Army.

What stranger was ever admitted to the intimacy of the family of a Spaniard, a Greek, or an Oriental? What stranger was ever received as a friend, invited to the house and treated as a favored guest by any of these? In the South all were hospitable. I was told that even the Creoles of Louisiana and Alabama exhibited the same qualities in some measure. As far as my own experience goes, there is, or shall I say there was, no country in the world where such boundless hospitality existed as in the Southern States. I had been only three days in Charleston before I received invitations which would have occupied weeks, perhaps months, with possibilities of infinite expansion. I was taken on trust, very flattering to one's *amour-propre*. I was pledged to nearly every one for a visit. I do not suppose that anyone of these is now alive. Their children have long probably passed middle age. Happily none of them could understand the terrible anger of their forefathers with their fellows.

It was necessary to go northwards, but I was bound first to visit Mr. Pringle, on the Peedee River. The house, a large old-fashioned mansion of low-browed rooms, and the walls hung with portraits of early colonels, governors, and their lovely womankind, stood near the river. There was an excellent library, French and English classics, books of travels, history, and an interesting collection of *Memoires pour servir* of the last century. The dinner, cooked by negroes and served by negroes in livery, was excellent. The Madeira, stored up between the attic floor and the high-thatched roof and brought down with religious reverence, had been born before the century opened. The ancestors of these luxurious planters, improvident in most things, had been wise enough to bottle up Bual and Sercial before the demon *oidium* corrupted their generous sources for ever. The general conversation after dinner was like that of country gentlemen over their wine about the time of the rebellion in Ireland. "Croppies" corresponded with Yankees. A sugges-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of mine that the negroes might rise against their masters was received with as much scorn as politeness would permit the company to express.

From Barnwell Island it was a short journey to Savannah, where I was the guest of Mr. Green. Savannah impressed me—a delightful, quaint city, spread out like a large Indian cantonment, with churches, detached houses, plantations, and gardens; open squares, fenced in by white rails; green swards, embellished with noble trees, magnolia, Pride of India, etc. Volunteers were drilling, bands playing in the stately avenues, where probably the Tatnalls, Oglethorpes, and pig-tail gentlemen sauntered in top boots in the old time ere there was any trouble about the rights of man or colonial jealousy of the old folks at home. Their descendants were now busy in preparing to resist an expected attack of American fellow-citizens, and General Lawton took me to see "the cartridge class" of his wife, who was engaged in making powder bags for cannon. The hall was filled with them, so were the parlors, and the General incidentally remarked that "it was not quite a safe place to smoke a cigar in."

Commodore Tatnall, Colonel Taliaferro, and the General took me next day to visit Fort Pulaski, named after a Pole who was mortally wounded in the defence of Savannah against the British.

Society at Savannah was not quite so vehement as it was in Charleston, but at an inn near Macon the landlord rejected a piece of gold in payment of his bill and demanded a Confederate note. "I don't want their stars and eagles," he said; "I hate the sight of them!"

The train from Savannah to Montgomery was crowded with office seekers, contractors, place hunters, volunteers, civil and military. The conversation was mostly about politics, "Lincolnites," "Black Republicans," the wickedness of Northern politicans and their folly. I looked out of the window as much as I could, for the atmosphere in the carriage was heated and smoke-laden, and I was struck by the absence of "peasantry." There were plenty of blacks, but not one white man did I see at work.

Montgomery was not then "much of a place," but "Congress" sat in a pretentious building. The hotel was crowded to suffocation, three beds in a room and mattresses on the floor. Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressmen, officers, and all were obliged to put up with what they could get. There were interesting men, filibusters and others, Howell Cobb, Wigfall, Pickett, Wheat, Henningsen, Calhoun, to talk to; "The Knights of the Golden Circle" convivial rather than chivalrous. Passing a slave auction, I was led into the Parliament chamber by Senator Wigfall just as the chaplain was evoking blessings on the arms of the Confederacy. The members, earnest, grave, stern-looking men, were eager to proceed to business. As I had a delegate's chair, I had been introduced to the "floor of the house." I was prepared for an interesting debate, when Mr. Howell Cobb thumped his desk and announced that "the House was going into secret session." So all strangers were obliged to leave, and accompanied by Mr. Wigfall, I went off to call on Mr. Davis.

The house in which the President lived was a modest villa, painted white, standing in a small garden. But we did not find the President at home, so we proceeded to the State Department, a large brick building, with the Confederate flag floating over it. On the first floor the words, "The President," were printed in bold characters on one of the doors. In a minute more I was in intimate conversation with the leader who, Mr. Gladstone said, "had made a nation," a slight, light figure of a man erect and straight, with a fine broad brow marked with innumerable wrinkles; regular features, eyes deep set, large and full, one partly covered with a film; thin and firm lips; chin square and resolute. He was dressed in a rustic suit of slate-colored tweed and his well-brushed hair and boots and neat attire offered a contrast to the appearance of Senator Wigfall and of the people crowding the passages. His manner was simple; his address rather formal; his face had a care-worn, haggard look, but his words were full of confidence. In the course of conversation in reference to some remark of mine he said: "Visitors to our country comment on the number of colonels and generals in the States. But the fact is, we are a military people and these strangers don't recognize the fact. We are the only people in the world where gentlemen go to a military academy to study and yet do not intend to follow the profession of arms." He was anxious to impress on me the aggressive character of the Northern States and government. "You see that we are driven to take up arms to defend our rights and liberties."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the President's room I was passed on to "the Secretary for War," Mr. Walker, with whom I found General Beauregard and some Confederate officers. Mr. Walker, a lean, tall man, straight-haired, fiery-eyed, much given to tobacco, received me very affably and promised me a *passe partout* wherever the patriot troops were to be found. He was in high spirits. "Two more Sovereign States have joined us, making ten States in the Confederacy, Sir! Creation! Isn't it too bad these —— Yankees won't let us go our own way, and keep their cursed Union to themselves? If they force us, I guess we will be obliged to drive them over the Susquehanna."

From the warlike Secretary, who was a lawyer, I passed on to the room of another lawyer who was his direct antithesis in manner and appearance, Mr. Benjamin, the Attorney-General of the Confederacy—a man who speedily attained a most extraordinary position at the bar in England after the war. Mr. Benjamin was a short, stout man with features of the Semitic cast; a full olive-colored face, lighted up by the most brilliant black eyes. He was lively and frank in manner, with great vivacity, and a very rapid utterance.

I had a curious experience in the Confederate capital that night. The Attorney-General had rubbed his hands with pleasure when he expatiated on the issue of letters of marque and reprisal as a consequence of the declaration of the state of war between the North and the Confederacy.

"Suppose, sir," said I, "the United States will not acknowledge your right and treat your privateers as pirates!"

"Sir," exclaimed Mr. Benjamin, "for every man under our flag whom the authorities of Lincoln dare to execute we shall hang two of their people."

"But England and the other great powers have abolished privateering."

"Yes! But the United States never accepted that condition of the Congress of Paris and the Confederate States are not bound by it. England cannot declare privateers under our flag to be pirates, for that would be a declaration of war against the Confederate States and England cannot afford that. You are coy about acknowledging a slave power. Our commissioners have gone on from England to Paris, but that will all come right soon.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There was a curious hitch, however, presently. The Assistant Secretary of State came to my room in great perplexity as I was going to bed.

"Neither Mr. Benjamin nor myself can find out the exact form for letters of marque and reprisal which we want for our privateers. You are a barrister and perhaps you may help us."

There were no books in the library to guide them, and it was a matter of importance to have the letters in order. I pleaded "*vafri inscitia juris*" as an excuse, though I might have objected to aid in my neutral quality in the levying of war *pro tanto*. Somehow or other, the difficulty was surmounted and various enterprising mariners went off a few days after with the necessary authority "to sink, burn, and destroy" the ships of the enemy.

Mrs. Jefferson Davis, called by her friends "Queen Varina," had a reception next evening, and I was glad to make the acquaintance of a very gracious, ladylike woman of lively and engaging manners, and to see her unceremonious little court in the modest villa called the White House—not quite a rival to that in Washington. The society was rather heated. The report that a reward had been set on the head of the Confederate President (quite untrue, I believe) had "fired the Southern heart." Indeed, when I remarked that I did not believe the Federal government was capable of such an act, I was regarded with disfavor by the company, and I promptly incurred Queen Varina's censure. "Indeed, but we know they are." It was distressing to hear some of the refined, elegant women at the White House talking of what appeared to me a brutal attack on the Massachusetts regiment in passing through Baltimore, but it was the opinion of the ladies that the New England soldiers deserved worse than death for their conduct. They were glad, too, that the Yankee soldiers in the United States forts were being eaten alive by mosquitoes, they raged with indignation at the idea of the Yankees daring to blockade the James River and Hampton Roads, and they said evil things of General Scott, "Old Fuss and Feathers." It reminded me of the man who spoke disrespectfully of the equator.

The night before I left Montgomery, I dined with Judah Benjamin and some gentlemen of New Orleans (Creoles). The conversation, more in French than in English, was confined to one topic. Mr. Benjamin walked with me to my hotel, and ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plied himself to press upon me that a blockade of the Southern ports was illegal, and that the English law officers must advise the British government to that effect. "It does no harm now," said he, "for all the cotton is shipped; but in October, when the Mississippi is bearing tens of thousands of bales, and all our wharves are piled up with it, the Yankees must come to grief." Many long years afterward I walked with Mr. Benjamin from a pleasant dinner party in Mayfair and reminded him of our conversation in Montgomery. "Ah, yes," he said, "I admit I was mistaken! I did not believe that your government would allow such misery to your operatives, such loss to your manufacturers, or that the people themselves would have borne it. And, let me tell you, though I have done now with politics, thank God! I consider your government made a frightful mistake which you may have occasion to rue hereafter."

Senator Wigfall, on the other hand, declared that Europe knew nothing of the South. "In England you only know of us through Northern writers! We are a primitive but a civilized people. We have no cities, we don't want them; we have no literature, we don't want it; we have no press, we are glad of it; we discuss public questions from the stump with our people. We have no shipping, no navy, we don't want them! Your ships carry our products, and your navy must protect them. We want no trading, mechanical, or manufacturing classes. Our rice, sugar, tobacco, and cotton enable us to purchase all we want from friendly nations; but we will never trade with the Yankees, never!"

Mr. Toombs, one of the pillars of the South, original, eloquent and earnest, an Anglomaniac in some respects, told me he considered our English policy "damnable." His only anxiety with regard to the coming war, which he looked upon as inevitable, was about the supply of gunpowder in the Southern States—a matter which troubled Wigfall, Rhett, Major Calhoun, Major Deas, Captain Ripley, and others; but Mr. Walker, the War Minister, seemed a very Gallio on that head. "Come back and see us when we have kicked the Yankees to ——, and when our government is established in all its grandeur at Richmond!"

W. H. Russell.

(*To be Continued.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

TO PURGE THE PENSION LIST.

It is always painful and humiliating to expose the weaknesses and shortcomings of the members of one's own profession, but the truth, like a severe surgical operation or a very bitter dose of medicine, often proves of great advantage in the long run.

I refer to the part played by the medical profession in constructing the fraudulent pension list which the tax payers of the United States have had saddled on them. Every man who sustained a mental or physical injury which in any way impaired his usefulness in after life should be liberally pensioned for such impairment, provided the injury was received while in the discharge of his duty as a soldier in the defence of the Union. This was the orginal theory of our pension system; it is common justice, and no one could object to it. When the war ended and the government started in to find out who had been permanently injured in its defence, it had to employ medical examiners. And just here politics and a false economy worked their most baneful influence. The position of examining surgeon for pensions became a reward for political activity in the interest of the party in power. But worse still is the fact, that the niggardly fees established by the government in payment for examinations and reports on the physical condition of applicants for pensions made it utterly impossible to secure anything like the best medical skill and experience.

No better proof of this latter statement is needed than the fact that the fees of a pension examiner in New York City, where the work is most arduous, averages less than one thousand dollars per year.

Maudlin sentimentality, the fact that the applicant for a pension happens to be the political or personal friend of the examiner, or that the examiner is his family physician, ought not to have any weight or influence on the report and recommendation of the medical examiner in a given case. The reports of the medical examiners should in all cases be made without fear, favor, or affection, and should turn entirely on the question: Did the applicant, while in the discharge of his duty as a soldier, receive an injury or contract a disease which has to any extent resulted in permanent disability? This is a question easily determined by honest and competent examiners.

Another fact should not be overlooked in this connection, viz.: A large percentage of mankind have one standard of honesty when getting money out of the treasury of an individual man, and quite another standard when getting it out of the nation's treasury, which is nothing but the joint property of all men.

If the officials selected by the people to seek out and properly compensate men who were disabled in the defence of the Union had exercised one-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

half the care that the life insurance companies do in avoiding bad risks, the pension roll would present a very different appearance from what it does to-day. Not only should the pension roll be the "nation's roll of honor," but the individual pensioner should point with pride to the fact that he had been honestly deemed worthy of the practical thanks of his countrymen. A pension should be regarded as the Republic's badge of nobility.

There has been too much secrecy and deviousness connected with the pension business of this country, and I blush to own that my profession has taken no small part in it. Here is a method by which frauds and pretenders can be gotten rid of. Let Congress pass a law requiring a re-examination of every pensioner, or applicant for pension, who bases his claim on physical disability contracted while discharging his duty as a Union soldier. A board of medical examiners should be established in each State—two or more boards might be required in some States to facilitate matters. Each board should be composed of two members, one a surgeon and the other a physician. They should be selected solely for their eminent and acknowledged professional ability and their honesty and standing in the State. They should give all their time to this work and be paid a salary of twenty thousand dollars each per year.

They should carefully examine every pensioner in their respective States and report to the government exactly the physical condition of each, and how much, if any, disability in any case was the result of service in the war of secession. They would be influenced by nothing except the physical facts presented, and always give the applicant the benefit of any doubt. Such a re-examination would require about one year to complete it, and would cost the government from two to three millions of dollars.

No man can predict certainly what the result of this re-examination would be. My experience for twenty years in the practice of my profession has made me familiar with the physical condition of a number of pensioners, and basing my opinion on my own experience I believe at least one-third of those claiming to have been permanently disabled while in the discharge of duty will be found to be frands, and would be dropped from the pension roll. In any event it would silence criticism, remove the stigma from deserving pensioners, and establish better relations between the general public who pay and the veterans of the war who receive pensions.

JOHN H. GIRDNER, M.D.

ARE THERE TOO MANY CHURCHES?

IT is scarcely a grateful task to criticise an institution, which, though it bears no political relation to the community, is nevertheless most intimately and vitally connected with its welfare. Yet it is safe to assume that many of those who love the Christian Church most and best, and who have ever cheerfully given largely, both of time and means, to promote its interests, are coming to recognize, albeit with pain, that very serious attention must be bestowed upon ecclesiastical economics. The conviction is growing that churchly luxuries are becoming an onerous tax upon communicants; that in many sections church buildings are obviously too numerous, and the expense incident upon their maintenance a constant drain upon their supporters. Too frequently also, in the struggle to meet such expense, questionable and even pronouncedly discreditable methods are resorted to.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must be regretfully acknowledged that the particular thing which the great evangelical prophet rapturously extolled as being "without money and without price" has become decidedly expensive in many quarters, and of even fabulous value in not a few. Indeed, a bird's eye view of the state of the Church, while embracing many fair stretches of sunlit evangelical scenery, also discloses some sombre perspectives which cannot but induce disquietude and alarm. The financial obligations of the Kingdom are great not because of the cost of telling the gospel story in far-away lands, nor—where it is needed quite as materially—in the great home centres of sin and degradation, but because of the erection and maintenance of too many, and too sumptuous edifices of worship, which exhaust the purses of those who assemble within their walls, and paralyze all other efforts than those of mere self-preservation.

It is literally as well as metaphorically true that the Kingdom—be it affirmed with all reverence!—is a sadly mortgaged one. And since it is so much holier than any demesne of mere terrestrial royalty, it consequently suffers the greater embarrassment and depreciation. True pastors of the flock, whose entire time ought to be devoted to various spiritual ministries, are frequently compelled to spend a large portion of it in devising means of relief for their financially distressed constituents and their official boards, while the subtle influence of the Kingdom, potent under normal conditions is irremediably negatived, much as the highly polished surface of a mirror is bedimmed by a breath.

The year-books of the various denominations tell a significant tale. Take, for instance, the statistics of one of the most influential bodies among the middle classes, in a highly populous and flourishing district. Upon fewer than two hundred churches (about two-thirds of the whole number) there is a mortgaged indebtedness of a million dollars. The annual interest is not less than fifty thousand dollars, and how to raise it is, in the majority of cases, a perennially perplexing problem. It is well known that in many churches promptness in meeting such obligations, as well as accounts due to tradesmen, is not a conspicuous characteristic.

The church mortgage is not a respecter of denominations; although, curiously enough, there is at least one body of Christian believers, which, whether from doctrinal peculiarity or economical considerations, erects no houses of worship, but appoints its meetings wherever they can be entertained—often, in rural communities, in barns! Conventional ecclesiastical æsthetics stand aghast, but in accordance with the eminently practical philosophy of the Book of Proverbs, it may be averred that an unconsecrated barn free of debt is preferable to a heavily mortgaged cathedral.

It is an open question whether it is ever justifiable to build exceedingly costly churches, even when they can be paid for. The exactions of the royal builder of the far-famed first Temple probably helped to pave the way for the disruption of his kingdom. A tithe of the money spent in the erection of fashionable churches, into which the poor will not go—another feature to be profoundly deprecated—would provide a host of neat, inexpensive edifices in neighborhoods where none are now found; or assist struggling societies in their very shadow, which are doing good work under adverse circumstances.

The exquisite New Testament incident of the alabaster box of precious ointment has often been wrested from its true setting to serve as an apology for lavish church adornment. But we dare not for a moment cherish the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conception that the sweet gift of penitence and love had been purchased "on credit."

Some of the means used to provide for current church expenses are unseemly in the extreme. While there are, of course, some entertainments which tend to edification, there are many others which bring a blush to the cheek of the lover of the exalted dignity of the Church. A "bazaar" is almo t invariably a monopoly of the business of little shops, whose keepers keenly feel the intrusion, even though they may not resent it. A church supper, or other form of sociable, when held occasionally to promote church fellowship, may be an actual means of grace; but rarely will it thus result when designed as a mercantile venture. The true principle of acceptable offerings should unvaryingly be taught, both by precept and example; and the measure of the gift should not be determined impulsively, after some eloquent and fervent appeal, but after deliberate meditation upon both the need and the available resources of supply.

The employment of children to canvass homes and places of business for the sale of tickets for church entertainments is open to grave criticism. More humiliating still, is the custom prevalent in many localities, of peddling from door to door all kinds of mysteries of cookery, and sundry other small merchandise, the profits to be applied to "clearing the church debt." Recently a confectioner besieged young people's societies throughout the land, with advertisements of "cough medicine" at low wholesale rates, to be sold in behalf of church support. This novel method of complying with the injunction to heal the sick is mildly suggestive of the materialistic tendency of the Church. But there are more flagrant practices —as, for instance, the popular minor lotteries—which the law of some States accounts gambling, and which the Head of the Church might be expected to rebuke with the whip of small cords, were He to appear in its midst.

It will, of course, be protested that a very small amount *per capita* is spent upon religion, when compared with the sums squandered upon luxurious dissipation. But this has not the slightest relation to the matter in question. It is admitted that many persons appear to have no adequate comprehension of obligation to "support the Gospel." But they cannot be compelled to subscribe to the treasury of the Church, nor has the spirit of Christianity ever contemplated such coercion. Let the Church do missionary work among such laggards, but meanwhile let the coat be cut, inexorably, according to the cloth; for the strain upon its conscientious and faithful supporters is often a crushing one. The laborer sorely feels the loss sustained by a week's enforced idleness, and the unavoidable expenses of the home are frequently severe upon the far more well to do. Low wages, the oft dearth of employment, the cost of medical attendance, the expensiveness of mortuary customs, precipitate many a family into a slough of despond from which it never emerges.

Under such circumstances there is little opportunity for "putting by for a rainy day;" yet the only salvation is to insist upon saving a little of the weekly earnings. Would it not be wise for the pulpit, whose advertised themes are not rarely widely divergent from the old-fashioned messages of the Gospel, to call the attention of the pew to the savings-fund system? There would be little risk of infracting the command not to lay up treasures upon earth, and there would be great gain in some quarters in rectitude of individual character, in general social conditions, and also in the world's estimate of the value of religious profession.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The discouraging circumstances which confront us compel the conclusion that many communities are overchurched; and that the struggle to maintain the buildings and secure the stipend of ministry—sometimes too large and oftener painfully meager—is too great to be endured by people of scanty means. Although it is frequently contended that the churches in the cities could not accommodate a tithe of the population, were it to become universally church-going, were it not wiser to wait until the present edifices are filled before building more? There is a maximum of spare space in the majority of them which might be occupied, who can tell, if it were not so costly. And in rural communities and small towns, especially in the eastern section of the United States, any thoughtful observer must admit that denominational zeal has far outrun discretion.

There was a time when a most efficient system of pastoral supply was maintained by certain denominations, by the grouping together of a number of churches in a "circuit," with a single pastor. It is quite credible that the preaching, infrequent as it was, was better digested and discussed than in these days of luxuriant pulpit diet, when every hamlet clamors for its convenient church and pastor; and villages which might creditably sustain a single church are hampered with four or five, because of the strong impulse of denominationalism. Surely in these days of felicitous interdenominational relationship the great-hearted leaders of the various folds could agree upon some such arrangement regarding the planting of churches at home as that which so wisely prevails in foreign missionary fields; so that a feeble church founded in a sparse community might be stimulated by hope, and not disheartened by rivalry. Perhaps it is too much to hope that the mint and cummin of the organizations may be altogether laid aside; but in view of the dissemination of the Scriptures, which are absolutely free to any one who is willing to accept a copy, of the wide circulation of religious newspapers, of the large purveyance of religious news by the secular press, and especially the generally evangelical character of the various denominations, is it too much to ask that when one of these has secured a foothold, its sisters shall not at once attempt to share the single cherry of constituency? No Utopian scheme of organic unity is hereby proposed, for the integrity of each denomination would be conserved, rather than weakened, and the cause of the general church immensely promoted.

And perhaps, with the new and genial environment which would ensue, meretricious methods of finance would disappear; and "Jonah's umbrella," raised occasionally by some minister driven to desperate straits to secure a congregation, be lowered and put permanently in a corner, while the simple themes of the Sermon on the Mount—as fresh and practical at the present day as they were when first delivered—would be presented to wondering and delighted flocks, which have long suffered from the malady of gospel indigestion, and the nightmare of the church mortgage which has so often succeeded the feast of fat things.

ALDEN W. QUIMBY.

SOME SOCIAL ASPECTS OF SCHOOL-TEACHING.

MANY persons who know something of the trials and difficulties which a public school teacher encounters in governing her school of fifty or sixty pupils, are yet unacquainted with the real problems of her real mission as a real guide and instructor who is responsible for the moral, intel-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lectual and physical development of those under her care. In the training of the minds committed to her charge she must employ the usual subjects of instruction—reading, arithmetic, science, geography, grammar, music, drawing and others; and it is oft-times thought that the use of these agencies is a very simple matter when once they are acquired by the teacher herself. The average laymen does not, and perhaps cannot, appreciate the difference between *knowing* a subject and understanding how to use it so as to secure proper development of the child mind; and he will accordingly judge that when one has finished his scholastic training he will have to think no more about the things he is going to teach, because he is already acquainted with them. This view has been quite commonly held in the past, but is being rapidly, and very rightfully, abandoned in our own day. The first requisite of a successful teacher now, aside from her ability to organize and control a number of pupils working together, is not be technically familiar with such subjects as reading, arithmetic, and the like, but be able to present them in such manner that the pupil will not only acquire them readily, but will be deeply interested in the process and will receive valuable discipline thereby.

A teacher in our times, then, must understand the minds of her children; she must comprehend the relation of the physical and mental, and must be a student of the influences of heredity, home life and environment upon the mind of each pupil whom she instructs. If she finds defects or deficiencies either emotional or intellectual, she must diligently and conscientiously single out the elements which make up the child's personality to see if she cannot find the cause, so that she may modify or eliminate the effect in a proper manner. This is of infinitely more importance than to possess technical knowledge of the branches of study—such knowledge, for example, as the lawyer has of law and the mechanical engineer has of machinery. There is great difficulty connected with this work also, for the study of the mind is necessarily very abstract, and no one can hope to attain much success in it unless he apply himself in the most diligent and watchful manner. In a way, of course, every one studies human nature, but yet very few know much about the workings of the mind. It is one thing to be able to judge in a general way of the character of individuals with whom we are associated; but it is an entirely different matter to know how that character may be developed or changed, and to understand the laws of mental action, so that when any certain effects are desired definite agencies can be applied to bring them about.

Besides these intellectual qualifications the successful teacher must possess other characteristics that are not thought to be absolutely essential for prosperity in most callings. Being as she is a model before the eyes of childhood at a time when everything is observed and imitated, she must possess graces of heart and person which will make her not simply an example worthy to be followed, but which will enlist the sympathy and affection of her pupils. Her features must be expressive and sympathetic; her voice gentle and modulated, and her manner gracious, quiet, and restful. Her dress must be attractve and becoming, and her whole bearing and personality such as will not only command the affection but the respect and confidence of her children. She must herself have affection and be ready in its expression. She must be glad and cheerful, ready in making friends, easy to approach, and social in nature. This may seem to be an ideal, but it is one that is constantly held before every teacher now, and if she fall far short of it her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tenure of office cannot be long, at least in positions that are at all desirable.

It would seem in view of these things that the teacher ought to be the best paid person of any profession; for when so much is required of her in the discharge of her arduous responsibilities in the schoolroom there is necessity for spending much time and money in preparation, and also in securing those aids toward physical and intellectual relaxation and comfort that will make it possible to endure the strain of hard and exacting labor. Even though the teacher possess the spirit of a missionary and receive a portion of her reward from the good she can do, still she cannot fly in the face of nature a great while without making restitution in some manner. Yet it is a lamentable fact that teachers on the average receive far less for their work than do the members of most if not all other professions. There are to-day in the public schools of elementary and secondary grade in our country over three hundred and eighty-eight thousand teachers who receive an average of fifty dollars per month. Among these are included many who have been trained in seminaries, colleges, and universities, and a large number who are graduates of normal and high schools. Most of them are obliged to reside away from home the greater part of the year, and so are at comparatively large expense in the maintenance of daily life. It can be seen that what is left after necessities are provided for must be very meagre indeed.

If it were possible now to ascertain the average income of the lawyers, doctors, and other professional men in the country it would in all probability appear to be a number of times that of the average school teacher. It is a fact of common observation that young men of ambition but of limited means who engage in public school-teaching continue at it but a short time—only long enough to accumulate a sufficiency to pay off debts, or to prepare for some other profession; and it is universally admitted that in a financial way a young man has far greater advantages as a lawyer, even of the pettifogger sort, than does a teacher of the finest quality. If we compare the salaries of those in the employ of the government in its various departments with the wages of public school teachers as already given we see that the most moderately paid positions yield at least twice as much as does school-teaching, while the most lucrative places yield many times as much as do the majority of places in public schools. Of course it would be hardly reverential to compare the highest positions in the gift of the state, as the presidency, headships of departments, judgeships in high courts, governorships, memberships in the national legislature, etc., with the best places in the public school service; but it would seem reasonable for teachers to expect that they should receive as much for their labors as a clerk or a typewriter in the employ of the government.

For the purpose of illustration an example is furnished in the case of the postmaster and the superintendent of schools in a town or city of any size, say 10,000. Here the postmaster will receive $2,500 and is allowed an assistant who performs nearly all the labor attached to the position, thus leaving the one at the head of affairs free to engage in other lines of business, as merchant, editor, or lawyer. In this same city the school man will receive at the most $2.000, and will be expected to spend every moment of the working hours of day and night in furthering the educational interests of the city, incidentally looking after the teachers, pupils and parents thereof. He must be a college-trained man of broad experience, have splendid executive abilities, and be a model in moods and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manners, so that the youth of the city may profit by his example. Another illustration may be found in comparing the county school commissioner with other county officers. At the time of election the superintendent is always put last on the ticket, or practically so; and in the matter of salary he hardly ever receives more, but rather usually less, than the county attorney who, to make a safe and modest estimate, does not do one-tenth the amount of work for the public that falls upon the school man. The man of law has abundant time to attend to private practice for private ends, and is at no expense for horses, carriages, and other means of conveyance that the county superintendent is obliged to possess; and if he had to endure such hardships as the superintendent ordinarily does there would probably not be enough legal men left in many counties after a time to fill the offices. The representative from the county to the state legislature receives ten dollars and upwards per day (with expenses allowed) for his presence in the comfortable rooms of the capitol; while the county superintendent of schools receives from two to five dollars per day (bearing his own expenses) for a life of trial and privation in endeavoring to elevate the educational tone of his community.

It may be said that a lawyer in the employ of the state, like a soldier, is an exceptional man and his services should be especially recognized; but it cannot be true that it takes better men to make lawyers or soldiers than it does to make teachers—men with more intelligence, or pluck, or courage, or physical endurance, or ability to act instantly upon emergencies. Public school-teaching is and has been discriminated against in the distribution of financial rewards for labors performed.

The effect of this is very unfortunate, not so much on account of the deplorable condition which public school-teaching is in, but because of the far greater benefit that might result to the community if it received its just deserts. As it is now, teaching is ruinous to the health and spirits of a large number of those who are engaged in it. Their incessant and arduous labors without opportunities for needed relaxation, and even the ordinary comforts of life, keep them in a worn and nervous condition which has already become so characteristic of the American public school-mistress that it is said to be possible to tell her wherever you see her. As a class they are known to be a plain folk, exceedingly modest in dress, too much so, indeed, to enter polite society; and the cause is evident—that the returns from their labors will not permit expensiveness of any kind, in dress, food, entertainment, or any of the things that bring relaxation and restfulness. When a gathering of public school teachers takes place in a town or city of considerable size, there is sometimes much merriment on the part of the citizens at the expense of the plain, commonplace appearance of the "wielders of the rod," as the newspapers put it.

The effect of this discrimination is most unwholesome upon pupils, for they are obliged to associate for six hours of the day, and nine months of the year with a teacher who, in far too many instances, is not a fit companion at all for childhood, because she has lost that cheerfulness and spontaneity which hard, unremitting labor with many cares and anxieties have been accountable for. There is apt also to be that severity and impatience in the classroom which comes from the worn condition of the teacher; and surely no influence could be more harmful to the child whose disposition and character are in a large way formed by the things his eyes and ears feed upon during his educable years.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must be apparent that these conditions seriously retard the true development of our commonwealth, because they encourage those who are lacking in qualities that would win them success in other fields to enter the profession of teaching. One must be blind who does not see that the principal criterion of worth and work in our times is the amount of money that services can command; and it may not be expected that those with superior endowments will remain where, if they continue, conditions will deprive them early of the use of their powers because of the arduousness of their duties, while at the same time they will be more poorly rewarded than in almost any other profession they might enter. Thus it has come about that in a way the less able and qualified persons in any community fall into the teaching profession because the most capable do not care to enter; and in many cases those in the profession who possess natural abilities leave it as soon as an opportunity offers itself, feeling that they might keep better company elsewhere, as well as have a more comfortable and satisfactory life.

It is not necessary to search far for the causes that have brought about this condition of affairs. In the first place, a vast amount of public money has been and is now appropriated for educational purposes; and there is a conviction among statesmen and public officials that a due proportion of the people's funds, considering other public interests, is already devoted to the cause of education. But a serious difficulty lies in the fact that there are more persons engaged in teaching than in all other matters of public concern combined; and when it is remembered that practically every adult in our country has passed from six to twelve years in a public school, the great magnitude of this business as compared with any other under public control can be appreciated.

But there are other factors which have operated to place teaching at a disadvantage, important among which is that it has not even yet attained the dignity of a profession in the eyes of the public, but is generally regarded as a makeshift, being done by those who for lack of better opportunities are driven to this as a last resort. And further, teachers as a class have not been considered an influential element in establishing the political or social tone of the community, so that those who make the laws, and in a way distribute public endorsement and patronage, are apt to overlook them, seeing only the lawers or business men who tower far above them. Tradition has in some way limited the teacher's activity to the schoolroom, and fear of public criticism finds it quite closely centered there even in our own time; and since it is only by active participation in all political and social matters that any individual or class of individuals can receive the attention due them by the public, it can be seen that because of his isolation from public affairs the teacher has a comparatively small showing. It may be that his business unfits him for much fighting in the political arena, for his purposes and methods are not often in harmony with those of the common politician; but however it be, it is evident that teaching has suffered because of the failure of its professors to show a strong hand in the establishment of laws and customs by which they are themselves governed, and by which their relations to the rest of the body politic are determined.

It is in a way a remarkable fact that everyone connected with the law, either in its making, its interpretation, or its execution, receives great rewards for his services; and all of the buildings and other equipment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary for the administration of law are always of the most elaborate and expensive kind. This may be accounted for partially by the fact that those who make the laws are in many cases engaged also in their interpretation and execution, and it is but natural that they should have first thought of themselves and their posterity; and this sort of thing is going on in every community at the present time. But in addition to this, however, there has always been a peculiar reverence for law and lawyers in our land, and in the times when every lawyer was a statesman perhaps this reverence was well placed; but in our own day it is probable that men who are not especially worthy or have responsibilities beyond what most other individuals of the community sustain are profiting by the favor which custom has always shown their species.

How now may matters be improved so that teaching will be rated higher in public estimation, and receive due financial rewards? The answer seems simple, that legislators must recognize the importance of the teacher in determining the safety and well-being of the state. However much may be professed by those in places of authority in regard to the education of the people being the safeguard of the nation, yet in practice they often fail to show the practice of their belief. The truth probably is, however, that legislators and statesmen have the cause of public education upon their minds less than they really think they do, or at least avow they do; and that those other matters of public interest,—the administration of law, improvements in various kinds of business enterprises, as agriculture, commerce, and so on—have absorbed most of their thoughts and sympathies, and so have profited best at their hands. From the teacher's point of view there seems to be no factor in American life which is now, and must ever continue to be, so influential in determining the course of national development as the public education of the people; and as worth and efficiency in any calling are secured only by adequate rewards it is evident that public school-teaching will never attain the position it should take until the present discrimination against it in financial matters, at least, ceases to exist.

It is not alone legislators and statesmen who fail to behold education in its true relation to other interests of public concern, but the people at large must themselves answer to the charge of short-sightedness in placing teaching in the position that it occupies in most communities. It is not unjust to say that in a large proportion of public school positions the cheapness of the teacher is a more important element in securing her election and retention than any qualification of scholarship, pedagogical insight, or character. This apathy on the part of the public is no doubt due to a lack of appreciation of the actual difficulties of the schoolmaster, as well as the importance of his work in the schoolroom; and until a right estimate of these can be arrived at and believed in by those who determine the character of public school-teaching in the various communities, there can be little hope for any improvement upon present conditions.

M. V. O'SHEA.

MASTERS AND SLAVES IN THE OLD SOUTH.

PROFESSOR LOMBROSO'S article in a recent number of the REVIEW contains a statement that is inconsistent with the facts. What prejudice or misinformation may have influenced him I do not know, but his words are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a slander, peculiarly unkind because aimed at a people already much and unjustly abused. I refer to the old slave-holding class of the South. Professor Lombroso is laboring under a wrong impression when he says: "The same may be said of the former slave-holders, who were so used to disposing of the lives of their slaves that no more importance was attached to the life of a negro than to that of a domestic animal in Europe." That the slave-holders were in the habit of, or "used" to, disposing of the lives of their slaves is absurdly false, and such a statement does the slave-holder of the old South grave injustice.

The first few years of my life were passed with those who were among the largest holders of slaves in the South—the Sea Island cotton planters. I never heard of but one case where a slave was killed by brutal treatment and that under heavy provocation. I recall very distinctly in what horror the deed was held, and that the man who committed it was socially ostracised—the severest punishment possible under the then existing law. There were, no doubt, other instances, but that the slave-owners were used to *killing their slaves* is a statement needing revision in the interest of truth. One of the most remarkable eatures of the war was the affectionate loyalty of the slaves for the families of their masters. While the men were at the front the negroes guarded the unprotected homes and supported the wives and children. At any moment, in thousands of homes, the slaves might have risen unopposed and killed these families. That they did not do it testifies at once to the affectionate and loyal disposition of the slave, and to the kindly treatment of master and mistress.

J. H. La Roche.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED